Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California



Engd by Wm. D. Smith.

REV. Wm. M. KENNEDY.

23
6

THE

F. W. Smith

METHODIST MAGAZINE

AND

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOLUME XVII.

NEW SERIES, VOLUME VI.

1835.

NEW-YORK,

PUBLISHED BY B. WAUGH AND T. MASON,
FOR THE METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, AT THE CONFERENCE OFFICE, 200 MULBERRY-STREET.

J. Collord, Printer.

1835.

THE

METHODIST MAGAZINE

CONTENTS.

ART. I.—Memoirs of the Rev. Matthew Henry, author of Commentaries on the Holy Bible 1

II.—Gospel Purity. A Sermon by the Rev. John Lindsey, of the New-England Conference 33

III.—Memoir of the Rev. John Groff. By the Rev. Joseph Holdich 45

IV.—Temperance Reformation. A Speech by Mr. Buckingham, on the extent, causes, and effects of Drunkenness. Delivered in the house of commons on Tuesday, June 3d, 1834 51

V.—On the Being and Sovereignty of God. A Discourse by the Rev. James Nicols, of the M. E. Church, at Somerville, N. J. 73

VI.—Theological Education 85

VII.—Brief Strictures on the Rev. Mr. Sunderland's 'Essay on Theological Education." By D. M. Reese, M. D. 105

VIII.—Reynolds on the Use of the Eyes . . . 118

IX.—President Ruter's Baccalaureate Address . . 121

X.—D. D. Whedon's Address on Colonization . . 129

XI.—Dick's Christian Philosopher 138

XII.—Memoirs of Hannah More. By William Roberts, Esq. 179

XIII.—Theological Education 204

XIV.—An Exegesis of Heb. vi, 4–6. By the Rev. George Peck 221

XV.—Paraphrase on Job 230

XVI.—The Colonization Cause 235

XVII.—A Discourse, delivered in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in White Plains, N. Y., on Dec. 25, 1834, in commemoration of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the organization of the M. E. Church, fifty years ago. By the Rev. P. P. Sandford 241

XVIII.—A Discourse on Water Baptism, delivered at East Greenwich, R. I., by the Rev. James Porter . . 254

XIX.—A short Essay on the character of the actions and sufferings of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. T. Merritt 263

XX.—An Address to the young ministers who were admitted into full connection with the Wesleyan Methodist conference. By the Rev. Richard Treffry . . 284

ART. XXI.—Bishop M'Ilvaine's Charge to the Clergy, delivered before the seventeenth annual convention of the Diocess at Chillicothe, Sept. 5th, 1834 302
XXII.—The Moral Influence of the Fine Arts. A Lecture delivered before the Boston Wesleyan Lyceum. By Edward Otheman 318
XXIII.—Third Annual Report of the New-York Colonization Society. 333
XXIV.—Theological Education 347
XXV.—Geology 352
XXVI.—Favorable Signs of the Times 356
XXVII.—A Sermon on the Divinity of Jesus Christ. By the Rev. John Dempster 361
XXVIII.—An Essay on Christian Perfection. By B. F. Shepard, of the Protestant Episcopal Seminary . 380
XXIX.—On Preparation to meet God. A Sermon by the Rev. H. W. Hilliard, of the Alabama Conference . 394
XXX.—Memoir of the late Rev. James Townley, D. D. By the Rev. Elijah Hoole 401
XXXI.—Professor Stuart's Essay, on the duty of the Churches in regard to the use of fermented wine in celebrating the Lord's Supper 411
XXXII.—Address delivered at the annual commencement of Dickinson college, July 16, 1835, by Robert Emory, A. M. 439
XXXIII.—Address delivered to the Peithologian Society of the Wesleyan University, August 25, 1835, by the Hon. E. Jackson, Jun. 447
XXXIV.—American Bible Society 459
XXXV.—Description of a Mound recently discovered on the banks of the Genesee river 476
XXXVI.—The nobleness of Humility 476

THE

METHODIST MAGAZINE,

AND

Quarterly Review.

Vol. XVII, No. 1. JANUARY, 1835. New Series—Vol. VI, No. 1.

MEMOIRS OF THE REV. MATTHEW HENRY,

Author of Commentaries on the Holy Bible.

Most readers of a work which has acquired any degree of celebrity, feel a desire to know something of the author; and that desire is increased, in proportion as they find themselves interested in the work itself. It may therefore be presumed, that the readers of Mr. Henry's writings, which have long been in high repute in the religious world, will wish for some information concerning the character and life of that excellent man, whose pen produced so many admirable performances. This is not merely an innocent, but a laudable curiosity, which we are happy to have the present opportunity of gratifying, on the republication of his smaller pieces, as well as his larger work on the Bible; most of which pieces have long been out of print; and we are persuaded, that the more the author is known, the greater pleasure pious readers will feel in the perusal of his writings.

A life of Mr. Henry was published, shortly after his decease, by his intimate friend, the Rev. Mr. Tong, but it is now become exceedingly scarce; and though it contains a just character and a faithful narrative, drawn from personal knowledge, as well as from private papers, the manner in which it is drawn up is not the most pleasing, the writer being then far advanced in life; and it is rendered prolix, and even tedious, by the insertion of too many extracts from his diary, and too many articles relative to Mr. Henry's acquaintance and his own, as well as various other particulars, which at this distance of time are become uninteresting. On these accounts it was judged advisable, instead of reprinting that work, to compose a new one. In this, however, all that appeared interesting in the former is retained, and whatever else could be collected, is inserted, particularly in relation to his settlement at Hackney, where some persons were living when the writer of this first came to that place, who had the happiness to be Mr. Henry's hearers, and remembered him well.

Mr. Matthew Henry was the second son of the eminently pious and excellent Mr. Philip Henry, whose life, published by him, is an admirable piece of biography, and who was ejected by the act of uniformity from his living in the parish of Worthenbury, in Flintshire, A. D. 1662. This his son was born October 28, in the same year, which also, he observes with pleasure in his diary, gave birth to many other ministers of his acquaintance, to whom God had appointed more peaceful days than their predecessors, whom their brethren, who hated them, had cast out. His birth place was Broad-Oak, in Iscoid, Flintshire, within the

parish of Malpal, which is in Cheshire; a district signalized in the British annals for the famous monastery of Bangor. Hither his father removed but a fortnight before his birth, not being suffered any longer to continue in the place of his former ministry; and here he spent the remainder of his days. Mr. Henry's mother was Mrs. Catharine Matthews, the daughter and heiress of Mr. Daniel Matthews, a gentleman of an ancient family and a considerable estate, which, upon his death, came into the possession of Mr. Philip Henry, by which he was enabled to live in comfort after his ejectment, and not only preach the Gospel gratis, as he had opportunity, but likewise to relieve several of his necessitous brethren. But his wife proved to him a greater treasure, as she was a woman equally eminent for piety and every other endowment. Her son has done ample justice to her character, in an excellent discourse, occasioned by her death, on Prov. xxxi, 28: 'Her children arise up, and call her blessed.' It is subjoined to the life of his father.

The circumstances of Mr. Henry's birth were rather remarkable. Beside its being premature, (as the writer of this has been credibly informed,) his mother's labor was so sudden, that she was delivered before any assistance could be procured; and he was so weakly a child that no one expected him to live. He was therefore baptized the next day after he was born, by Mr. Holland, the minister of the parish, but without godfather or godmother; and his father desired the sign of the cross might not be used, but the minister said he durst not omit it.

When he was about five years old, he had the measles, by which his brother, who was a year older than himself, was cut off; a circumstance which deeply affected him, and which he noticed with great seriousness, in a paper written on his birth day, when he had completed his thirteenth year, wherein he drew out a list of the mercies which he had received, with lively expressions of gratitude to the Author of them. He long continued weakly, subject to agues and other complaints; but he very early discovered a good mental capacity, and a thoughtful turn, so that it was remarked his childhood had less of vanity than that of most children, and that at an earlier period than is usual, he put away childish things. He was able to read a chapter in the Bible distinctly when he was but about three years old, and was used to make pertinent remarks on what he read.

His first abiding convictions of religion, according to his own written account, in the paper above referred to, were wrought when he was ten years of age, in consequence of a sermon preached by his excellent father, on Psalm li, 17: 'The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise.' 'I think it was that,' says he, 'that melted me: afterward I began to inquire after Christ.' He was early accustomed to make memorandums of the sermons which he heard, and of the effect they had upon his mind. From one of these papers, dated December 17, 1673, it appears that he heard a sermon on the signs of true grace, which put him upon the strict examination of himself by the rules which had been laid down; and, after opening his mind to his father, he was encouraged to draw a favorable conclusion respecting his spiritual state. He particularly mentions his repentance for sin, according to the Scripture account of

it, in many passages which he transcribes; his solemn dedication of himself to God, according to the tenor of the Gospel covenant, and his love to God, as evidenced by his love to the people of God, whom he chose as his best companions; and his love to the word of God, concerning which he expresses himself thus: 'I esteem it above all; I desire it as the food of my soul; I greatly delight both in reading and hearing it; and my soul can witness subjection to it, in some measure; I think I love the word of God for the purity of it; I love the ministers and messengers of it; I rejoice in the good success of it; all which were given as marks of true love to the word, in a sermon I lately heard, on Psalm cxix, 140: "Thy word is very pure, therefore thy servant loveth it."'

In the same paper, which contains a catalogue 'of the mercies of God to him, both temporal and spiritual,' he mentions it as matter of peculiar thankfulness that he was blessed with pious parents, who took so much pains in his education, and by whose means he was brought so early to devote himself to God. After noticing with thankfulness his recovery from an ague which had hung long upon him, he mentions his first application to learning. It will be pleasing to the reader to see his own words.

'After this sickness, in the year 1669, I had health, and began to learn my grammar. Blessed be God that gave me an understanding! Mr. Turner entered me a little into the principles of grammar, and my father has carried me on in it; the Lord grant that he may live to perfect it!' As a proof of his affection to this his excellent father, as well as of his piety to God, the following addition is here subjoined: 'In March, 1669, my dear father had a sore fever; we thought he would have died; but our extremity was God's opportunity, and He arose and helped us.'

It was observed by all who knew him, that he was remarkably quick in learning any thing, and that he possessed a strong memory to retain it. He was early addicted to close application to his studies, and remarkably provident of his time; so that his good mother, fearful lest he should injure his health, was sometimes obliged to call him down from his closet and advise him to take a walk in the fields.

His whole conduct, in the happy family of which he was a member, was amiable and exemplary. As he ever manifested the greatest duty and deference to both his pious parents, so he exercised the utmost affection and kindness toward his sisters. They all lived together in the most delightful unity: and he made it his business and his pleasure to promote their best interests, both by his admonitions and his prayers. His father recommended it to them to spend an hour together every Saturday afternoon, in religious exercises, with a view to their preparation for the Sabbath; and he conducted them with great propriety, to their mutual advantage.

He was always very regardful of his father's instructions, and with uncommon diligence he attended to his preaching; with which he was sometimes so deeply affected, that, as soon as the service was ended, he would retire to his closet, to weep and pray over what he had been hearing, and would hardly be prevailed upon to come down to dinner, lest the memory and impression of it should be effaced.—He sometimes took an opportunity, especially in walking with his

father, to relate to him the impressions which his discourses made upon him, and to open to him freely any difficulties that occurred to his mind; which proved of excellent use for his farther information and encouragement.

It seems that Mr. Henry had an inclination to the ministry from his childhood. This partly appeared in his fondness for imitating preaching, which he did with a great degree of propriety and gravity beyond his years; as also in his frequent attendance at the private meetings of good people, with whom he would pray, and repeat sermons, and sometimes expound the Scriptures, to the surprise of all present. One of them once expressed to his father some concern lest his son should be too forward, and fall into the snare of spiritual pride; to whom the good man replied, 'Let him go on; he fears God and designs well, and I hope God will keep him and bless him.'

Mr. Philip Henry was used generally to have some young student in his house, previous to his entrance on the ministry, who, while he was a pupil to Mr. Henry, acted as a tutor to his children. One of these was Mr. William Turner, who was born in that neighborhood, and had studied at Edmund Hall, Oxford. He was afterward many years vicar of Walburton, in Sussex, and was the author of a work in folio, on the History of remarkable Providences. He lived with Mr. Henry at the time his son entered on his grammar, and was the person referred to by him in the papers quoted above, as having initiated him into the Latin language; and it may be supposed, from his great piety and studious turn, that he was in other respects useful to him.—Mr. M. Henry remained under his father's eye and tuition till he was about eighteen years of age, from which he enjoyed singular advantage for both literary and religious attainments, to qualify him for the ministerial office; and he soon afforded ample proof that he had not enjoyed them in vain. As his constitution grew stronger with his growing years, his mind also improved in knowledge, grace, and holiness, so that he was richly furnished betimes for the important office to which he had devoted his life, and seemed not to need any farther assistance than he had enjoyed, or might yet enjoy, under the tuition, and from the example, of such a father, who was not only an excellent scholar himself, but had an admirable method of communicating knowledge to others. He was desirous, however, that his son might enjoy some farther advantages in his education at some more public seminary.

Mr. P. Henry had been partial to a university, having himself passed some years at Christ Church, Oxford. But the sad alteration which had taken place in those seats of learning, after the restoration, greatly altered his opinion; so that, to preserve his son from the snares and temptations to which he might have been exposed from the want of proper discipline, he determined upon sending him, in the year 1680, to an academy which was then kept at Islington by the learned and pious Mr. Thomas Doolittle, who trained up many young men for the ministry, who made a distinguished figure among the Protestant dissenters. Here, among many other excellent young persons, he enjoyed the society of Mr. Bury, who was from the same neighborhood, and afterward an eminent minister, who bore this honorable testimony to Mr. Henry's character during the course of his studies: 'I was never better pleased,' says he, 'when I was at Mr. Doolittle's, than when I

was in young Mr. Henry's company. He had such a savor of religion always upon his spirit, was of such a cheerful temper, so diffusive of all knowledge, so ready in the Scriptures, so pertinent in all his petitions, so full and clear in all his performances, &c, that he was to me a most desirable friend, and I love heaven the better since he went thither.' Mr. Bury observes, however, that 'he had an almost inconceivable quickness in his speech, but that he afterward happily corrected it as well for his own sake, as for the benefit of others.'

Another of Mr. Henry's fellow students was Mr. Henry Chandler, afterward an eminent minister at Bath, and father of the learned Dr. Chandler, of the Old Jury, London. In a letter to Mr. Tong, he speaks of Mr. Henry in the following respectful terms: 'It is now thirty-five years since I had the happiness of being in the same house with him, so that it is impossible I should recollect the several [particulars] that fixed in me such an honorable idea of him, that nothing can efface while life and reason last. This I perfectly well remember; that, for serious piety and the most obliging behavior, he was universally beloved by all the house. We were near thirty pupils when Mr. Henry graced and entertained the family, and I remember not that ever I heard one of the number speak a word to his disparagement. I am sure it was the common opinion, that he was as sweet tempered, courteous, and obliging a gentleman as could come into a house; his going from us was universally lamented.'

How long he continued with Mr. Doolittle is not quite certain.—Such was the persecuting temper of the times, that this good man was obliged to leave Islington, (upon which he removed to Battersea,) and soon after to disperse his pupils into private families at Clapham, to which place it does not appear that Mr. Henry followed them. It is certain, however, that when he quitted this academy, he returned to his father's house, where he pursued his studies with great assiduity. Among his papers is one dated Broad-Oak, 1682, (about which time it seems probable that he returned thither,) which is a memorial of the mercies which he had received from the hand of God from his birth to that time, which was his birth day: it consists of twenty-six particulars, and discovers a lively spirit of devotion.

Mr. Henry was now twenty years of age, and had made great improvement in all the branches of science, which tended to fit him for appearing with great advantage under the ministerial character. But it does not appear that he had yet begun to exercise his talents in public. He was, however, frequently engaged in social exercises of devotion among the good people of his father's acquaintance, and who resorted to that house of prayer. His company was much coveted by them, and they were highly gratified by his visits, which he was ever ready to make to the meanest of them; when he was used to pray with them, and converse with great freedom, affection, and judgment, on their spiritual concerns. Greatly delighted were they to see such a son treading so closely in the steps of such a father; and his memory was long precious in that neighborhood, and in the adjacent country, where Mr. Philip Henry used frequently to preach in the houses of those pious gentlemen who entertained the ejected ministers, though they generally attended the worship of the established Church.

As the times were dark, and the circumstances of dissenting minis-

ters were very discouraging, Mr. Henry had no prospect of a pastoral settlement with a congregation; he therefore, with the advice of friends, directed his thoughts to another and very different employment. He had formed an intimacy with Rowland Hunt, Esq., of Boreaton, who married the daughter of Lord Paget, and at whose house Mr. P. Henry used to preach once a quarter, and administer the Lord's Supper. This worthy gentleman advised his father to enter him in one of the inns of court, for the study of the law. His view in this was not to divert him from his design of pursuing the work of the ministry, but to find him some present employment of his time, as he was but young, which might hereafter be advantageous to him, not only in a temporal view, as he was heir to a handsome estate, but as it might be subservient to his usefulness as a minister. Accordingly, Mr. Henry went to Gray's-Inn, about the end of April, 1685.

Some of his friends discovered painful apprehensions lest this situation, and the connections he might here form, should prove unfavorable to his religious interest, and, in the issue, divert him from the sacred office to which his former studies had been directed, and for which he discovered such peculiar qualifications. But their fears happily proved groundless; his heart was fully bent for God, and established with grace; so that he still maintained his steadfastness amidst all the temptations with which he was surrounded. He happily formed an acquaintance with several young gentlemen, then students of the law, who were exemplary for sobriety, diligence, and religion, who were glad to receive him as an intimate associate, and with whom a mutual friendship continued to the last. Here his diligence in study, his quick apprehension, his rapid proficiency, his tenacious memory, and his ready utterance, induced some of the profession to think that he would have been eminent in the practice of the law, had he applied himself to it as his business. But he felt himself under no temptation to relinquish the object of his first resolution, and he continually kept that in his view, habituating himself to those exercises which might farther his preparation for it. He heard the most celebrated preachers in town; among whom he seemed to be best pleased with Dr. Stillingfleet, at St. Andrew's, Holborn, for his serious, practical preaching; and with Dr. Tillotson, at Lawrence Jewry, for his admirable sermons against popery. He accustomed himself to take notes of what he heard; and he constantly sent a short scheme of the sermons to his father, to whom he generally wrote twice every week, giving him an account of all remarkable occurrences with great judgment, yet with all the caution and prudence which the difficulties of the times required.

During his residence in London, Mr. Henry not only attended with constancy on the public worship of God, but he promoted social prayer and religious conference with his particular friends, and he sometimes expounded the Scripture to them. When he was about to leave them he delivered to them an excellent and affecting discourse, on 2 Thess. ii, 1: 'By the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him;' recommending to himself and them the hope of that blessed meeting, as their greatest comfort, now they were about to part. The letters which he wrote to his friends while he continued at Gray's-Inn, discover the lively sense of Divine things which he pre-

served upon his mind, of which an excellent one of great length is published by Tong, to his friend Mr. G. Illidge, of Nantwich, whose father's memoirs he afterward printed: from whence it appears how valuable a correspondent he was, and how much he aimed at usefulness, in his letters as well as in his conversation.

But though his time was not unprofitably spent in London, he sometimes complained of the want which he felt of those opportunities which he had enjoyed in his father's house: his 'Broad-Oak Sabbaths, and the heavenly manna,' which he had tasted there; and expressed his earnest wishes to return. Accordingly, in the month of June, 1686, he went down to Broad-Oak, and continued several months in the country; when he made it appear that his residence in London, and his study of the law, had been no way prejudicial to his religious temper, or his ministerial qualifications. He now began to preach frequently as a candidate for the ministry, and he every where met with great acceptance.

About this time he went to visit his friend Mr. Illidge, at Nantwich, who had been in a remarkable manner brought to a sense of religion by the ministry of Mr. P. Henry, and who was very zealous in promoting the spiritual benefit of his neighbors. Mr. M. Henry spent several days with him, and preached in his house every evening to a considerable number of people, of whom several dissolute persons appeared to be deeply impressed with what they heard. One instance was very remarkable. The last evening, Mr. Henry preached on Job xxxvii, 22: 'With God is terrible majesty.' Mr. Illidge, observing one man present whom he knew to be notoriously wicked, went the next morning to his house, to see what impression this alarming discourse had made upon him; when he found him in tears, under a deep conviction of sin, and the apprehension of misery. He found his wife also weeping with him, on account of her husband's distress.—Mr. Illidge gave him the best instruction he could, and prayed with him. He also made known his case at Broad-Oak, that he might have farther help from thence. There soon appeared a great change in him. He manifested a deep and abiding concern about his eternal state, and that of his wife, whom he taught to read. He set up prayer in his family, went often to the meeting at Broad-Oak, and at length was admitted to the Lord's Supper. He sometimes spoke of the joy he felt at the remembrance of what God had done for him, and he maintained a hopeful profession of religion for some years. His wife also gave proof of her conversion, and died, to all appearance, a good Christian. But he afterward relapsed into sin, to the great grief of his best friends, and the dishonor of religion. Whether he was effectually recovered does not appear.

Mr. Henry's great acceptance and success, at the commencement of his ministry, encouraged him to prosecute it with increasing ardor. Having occasion to take a journey to Chester, some good people there, who had heard of his fame, desired him to preach to them one evening in a private house; liberty for public worship not being yet granted. He readily consented, and preached three evenings successively at different houses in the city. The specimen which these good people had now received of his talents excited in them an earnest desire to have him settle with them; having about two years before lost two

aged and faithful ministers; and another in the city, Mr. Harvey, being far advanced in years, and preaching very privately. Being encouraged by a prevailing report that government was disposed to grant indulgence to dissenters, some of them went about the latter end of the year to Broad-Oak, to express to him their wishes for his continued services. He was then in the twenty-fifth year of his age.—On consulting with his father, and thinking there was the voice of Providence in the affair, he gave them some encouragement to hope for a compliance with their invitation, if liberty should be granted, provided Mr. Harvey consented, and they would wait till his return from London, where he was going to reside some months. They expressed their readiness to receive him upon his own terms, and in his own time.

On the 24th of January, 1687, he set out for London with the only son of his friend Mr. Hunt. At Coventry he heard that there had been a fire at Gray's-Inn, and at Holborn's-Court, where he had a chamber; upon which he wrote to his father, that he expected that the effects which he had left there were all lost; but on his arrival, he had the pleasure to find that, by the care of a chamber fellow, most of them were saved. The first material news he heard in London, was that the king had granted indulgence to the dissenters, and had empowered certain gentlemen to give out licenses: the price of one for a single person was ten pounds; but if several joined, sixteen pounds; and eight persons might join in taking out one license.

Not many dissenters took out these licenses; but the disposition of the court being sufficiently understood, many began to meet publicly. About the end of February, Mr. Henry wrote to his father, that Mr. Faldo, a congregational minister, had preached, both morning and afternoon, to many hundred people, at Mr. Sclater's meeting in Moorfields. The people of Chester now reminded him of his engagement to them, the propriety of which he sometimes was ready to question, but he did not hesitate to fulfil them. The reverend and learned Mr. Woodcock came to him, and told him that he wished to engage him in a lecture which was set up chiefly for young persons; but thanking him for his respect, he modestly declined the offer, and said that his service was most wanted in the country, and might be most suitable there.

Mr. Henry now began to think seriously on the business of ordination, and consulted some ministers about it, particularly Mr. Tallents, of Salop, who had been some time in London, and Mr. James Owen, who was lately come up from Oswestry, both of whom had known him from his childhood, and they gave him all possible encouragement in this design. He viewed the ministerial office in so awful a light, that he set himself to consider the engagement into which a person enters in his ordination to it, with the greatest seriousness. He drew up, on this occasion, chiefly for his own use, a discourse on 1 Tim. iv, 15: 'Give thyself wholly to them;' in which he stated the nature and several parts of the ministerial work, and what it is for a man to be 'wholly in them,' (as it is in the Greek,) and then proceeded thoroughly to examine his own heart, with respect to his fitness for them. The paper is entitled, 'Serious self examination before Ordination;' with this text prefixed: 'Search me, O God, and know my heart,' &c.

'It is worth while,' says he, 'for a man at such a time, deliberately to ask himself, and conscientiously to answer, the six following questions: 1. What am I? 2. What have I done? 3. From what principle do I act in this undertaking? 4. What are the ends I aim at in it? 5. What do I want? 6. What are my purposes and resolutions for the future?' —To each of these questions he gives a distinct answer, in several particulars, at a very considerable length, which fill more than four large folio pages. The whole discovers the utmost seriousness, humility, and conscientious regard to truth and duty.

About this time a respectable person, whom he had consulted about his ordination, intimated to him an apprehension that he might possibly obtain it from one of the bishops, without those oaths and declarations to which the dissenters objected. This probably took its rise from the moderation which the clergy were now disposed to show toward the nonconformists, in consequence of the king's declaration for liberty of conscience, which they knew originated in his intention to promote popery. Whether there was any solid ground for the apprehension or not, it appears that the intimation of his friend induced Mr. Henry to investigate the question with the utmost care and impartiality, 'Whether it be advisable for one that hath devoted himself to the service of God in the work of the ministry, but is by no means satisfied with the terms of conformity, to choose ordination by episcopal hands (if it may be had without any oaths and subscriptions) rather than ordination by presbyters.' Having fairly stated, in writing, (dated April 28, 1687,) the arguments which occurred to him on both sides, with earnest prayer for direction, he determined for the negative, and applied to those ministers in London to whom he was best known, for their assistance in the solemn service.

On the 9th of May, these ministers met on the occasion, but where it was we have no account. The times were such as rendered a private ordination most eligible, in the opinion of the ordainers, who were all of the Presbyterian denomination, and who conducted the service in the manner which was common among the Presbyterians of that day, and long after. We have no information respecting either a sermon or a charge delivered, as is usual on such occasions; but among Mr. Henry's papers was found the Latin Thesis which he delivered on the question—*An justificemur Fide absque operibus Legis?* Affirmatur.—Mr. Tong has given an abstract of it, and has subjoined Mr. Henry's confession of faith, which perfectly agrees with the Assembly's Catechism.

For the same reason that the ordainers chose to have the service performed in private, they declined giving a certificate of the ordination in the usual form, (which seemed to be an excess of caution,) and only gave this brief testimonial:—

'We, whose names are subscribed, are well assured that Mr. Matthew Henry is an ordained minister of the Gospel.

Sic Testor, W. Wickens,
Fran. Tallents,
"*May* 9, 1687." Edw. Lawrence,
Nath. Vincent,
James Owen,
Rich. Steele.'

Of so much importance was a regular certificate of Presbyterian ordination esteemed in those days, that Mr. Henry, after he had been settled many years, and had many *living epistles* to witness for him, applied to the ordainers then living to give him a certificate in form; which had the signatures of Mr. Tallents and Mr. Owen, dated Dec. 17, 1702. It was remarkable, that one of the above ministers who engaged in Mr. Matthew Henry's ordination, was also employed in the ordination of his excellent father, Mr. Philip Henry, near thirty years before. This was Mr. Richard Steele, the author of that valuable Treatise on Old Age.

Mr. Henry, soon after his ordination, hastened down to Chester, to enter upon his pastoral charge. He left London the latter end of May, and went first to Broad-Oak, where he stayed but a short time. Several persons of the congregation came to meet him there, and conducted him to Chester, where it is needless to say how joyfully he was received, especially on account of the liberty which was now granted to the dissenters, though the object of the king in granting it was sufficiently known. Worship had hitherto been kept up in the house of Mr. Henthorne, which was large and commodious, but only between and after the hours of public service at the established Church, where most of the people attended to hear Dr. Fogg and Dr. Hancock, whose ministry they highly valued. Their numbers, however, so much increased, that it was found necessary to provide a larger place. With this Mr. Henthorne, who was zealous in the cause, soon accommodated them against the time of Mr. Henry's coming; having a large out-building, belonging to the Friary, which was in his possession. The work of fitting it up was begun on a Monday, and it was in sufficient forwardness to be opened for worship the next Lord's day. But Mr. Henry did not arrive till the Thursday following, which was the lecture day, when he preached his first sermon, on 1 Cor. ii, 2: 'I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified.' Mr. Tong, who was present on the occasion, says, 'I am a witness that they received him as an angel of God.' But before he would preach, such was his respect to the aged and worthy Mr. Harvey, that he made him a visit, in order to be satisfied that his coming to Chester was with his approbation; for without it, he assured him that he would return. The good old man soon satisfied him on this head, telling him that there was work enough in Chester for them both. They afterward lived in the most perfect harmony. Mr. Henry constantly attended his Thursday lecture, and always behaved toward him as a son to a father. He also advised all his friends to show him all possible respect, as a faithful minister of Christ, who had many years labored there in the Gospel, and had also been a sufferer for it.

Mr. Henry's situation at Chester proved highly agreeable to him, on account of the valuable society he met with there, and it was soon rendered the more so, as three of his sisters were providentially brought to reside in that place, in consequence of their being married to respectable and pious men, who belonged to his congregation, (Mr. Radford, Mr. Holton, and Dr. Tilston,) to whom he conducted himself with a truly fraternal affection. But a yet more agreeable and important circumstance was his entrance into the conjugal state, with a lady who was possessed of every qualification to render that state happy. This

was Mrs. Catharine, daughter of Mr. John Hardware, of Moldsworth. On his first proposal, some obstacles lay in the way, but they were so completely removed, that the match was as agreeable to her parents as it was to his, so that they came to reside at Chester, and they all lived together. But this pleasing scene, like many earthly ones, was of very short continuance; for within a year and a half Mrs. Henry was seized, in childbed, with the smallpox, and died, Feb. 14, 1689, though the child was spared. Mr. Tong, who lived within eighteen miles, came to visit this house of mourning; who, having described the manner in which the tender mother was affected, says of Mr. Henry, the first words he spoke to him, with many tears were these: 'I know nothing could support me under such a loss as this, but the good hope I have that she is gone to heaven, and that in a little time I shall follow her thither.'

It was no small alleviation of his grief, that the child was spared.—His good father came to visit him on the occasion, when he baptized the child in public, and the scene was peculiarly solemn and affecting. Mr. Henry, on presenting his child in baptism, (whom he named after her mother,) professed his faith and renewed his covenant, in a most affecting manner, and then added, 'Although my house be not so with God, yet He hath made with me an everlasting covenant, &c. I offer up this my child to the great God, a plant out of a dry ground, desiring it may be implanted into Christ.' Every heart was full, and few dry eyes were seen.

Under this severe affliction, God strengthened his heart and his hands, so that he pursued his work with his usual diligence and vivacity. At length a kind Providence repaired his loss, and the mother of his deceased wife was the means of procuring him another. She recommended to him the daughter of Robert Warburton, Esq., of Grange, the son of Peter Warburton, Esq. sergeant at law, and one of the judges of the common pleas. He was a gentleman fond of retirement, who constantly had the Bible and Baxter's 'Saints' Rest' on the table before him, and whose house was a sanctuary to the silenced ministers. Mr. Henry's marriage to this lady was consummated, July 8th, the same year, at Grange, when both his father and mother were present, who were greatly pleased with the new relation, and blessed God who had thus filled up the breach. Mr. and Mrs. Hardware now left Chester, and retired to an estate which they had in Wirral, but their affection for Mr. Henry as a son continued.

From this time he kept a regular diary of all material occurrences and transactions to the end of his life; a practice which he had lately recommended to his friends, in a discourse on 'Redeeming the Time.' From this diary of his the following part of his history is principally taken. We shall now give some account of his family by this second marriage, and the manner in which he governed it.

In the space of twenty-two years he had nine children, eight of which were daughters. Three of them, namely, the first, second, and fourth, died in their infancy. The first of these children was born, April 12, 1691, on which occasion he made his will; but she died in about a year and a half. In his diary he makes many pious remarks on this event, and the night of her funeral he writes thus: 'I have been this day doing a work I never did before—burying a child. A sad

day's work! But my good friend, Mr. Lawrence, preached very seasonably and excellently, from Psalm xxxix, 9: "I was dumb, I opened not my mouth, because thou didst it."'

On the birth of the fourth of these children, he writes, June 24, 1697, 'This child has come into a world of tears;' for his pious father, who had taken a pleasure in coming to baptize his grandchildren, (which he did in a peculiarly interesting manner,) was now dead, and he was particularly affected at the recollection of that event, as it happened the very same day of the month the preceding year. But says he, 'God has set the one over against the other, that I may sing of mercy and judgment.' But this child was taken away in less than a year and a half; upon which occasion he writes, 'My desire is to be sensible of the affliction, and yet be patient under it. It is a smarting rod; God calls my sins to remembrance—the coldness of my love, my abuse of spiritual comforts.' But he adds, ''Tis a rod in the hand of my Father. I desire to see a Father's authority, who may do what He will; and a Father's love, who will do what is best. We resign the soul of the child to Him who gave it. I am in deaths often; Lord, teach me how to die daily,' &c.

On May 3, 1700, God was pleased to give him a son. But his birth was attended with such uncommon danger both to the mother and the child, that he mentions it as a miracle of mercy that their lives were spared. This child Mr. Henry himself baptized on the lecture day, in the following week, by the name of Philip,* when he preached on the occasion from 2 Sam. vii, 14, 15. When this child was about a month old, he was so ill that there was but little hope of his life; and Mrs. Henry continued in such weakness, increased by her anxiety about her infant, that she, and all her friends, expected her speedy dissolution. But God mercifully interposed, and restored both her and her child. On this occasion Mr. Henry made a new will, which he did with exemplary prudence and seriousness, earnestly begging Divine direction in this matter, as he did in every other, respecting himself, his family, and his friends. His diary affords ample proof how he acknowledged God in all his ways, and what an affectionate interest he took in the concerns of all with whom he was connected.

We shall now notice his conduct in his family, which was in a great measure regulated by the example of his pious father, of whose house those who had access to it were ready to say, 'This is no other than the house of God, and the gate of heaven.' Mr. Henry was constant in the worship of God in his family, morning and evening, which nothing was suffered to prevent. He called all the members of it together as early in the morning as circumstances would permit; and he did not delay it to a late hour in the evening, lest drowsiness should prevent devotion. He was never tedious, but always full and comprehensive, performing much in a little time, which seldom exceeded half an hour. He began with a short invocation for assistance and accept-

* It appears that he took the name of Warburton, upon inheriting the estate of his maternal grandfather: and there was too great a propriety in his relinquishing the name of *Henry*, as he had departed from the spirit of his pious ancestors of that name. But his father, who often tenderly mentions him in his diary, did not live to witness the unhappy change.

ance. He then read a portion of Scripture, (in the morning from the Old Testament, and from the New in the evening,) giving a short exposition, in a plain and familiar manner, so as to render it both intelligible and pleasant, and added practical reflections. To engage the greater attention, he used to examine some of his family how they understood, and what they remembered of what they had heard.—After this, some part of a psalm was constantly sung, from a collection which he himself made, entitled, 'Family Hymns,' selected from different translations of the Psalms; and every one had a book, to prevent the interruption occasioned by reading the lines. After singing, he prayed with great affection and propriety, noticing every particular case in his family, and not omitting the state of the nation and the Church. This variety prevented the service from being tedious, and his whole family attended it with pleasure. When the whole was ended, the children came to him for his blessing, which he gave with solemnity and affection.

Beside his stated family worship, he occasionally kept family fasts, as special circumstances required; when he sometimes called in the assistance of his friends, whose respective cases and trials were committed to God with his own.

On the Lord's day he did not omit any part of his ordinary family worship, but rising earlier on that day, after his private devotion he began it somewhat sooner. On returning from the public morning service, after he had dined, he sung a psalm, offered a short prayer, and then retired till the time of the afternoon service. In the evening he usually repeated the substance of both his sermons, in his family, when many of his neighbors came in: this he followed with singing and prayer, and concluded with singing two verses more, previous to the benediction. Before supper, he catechised the younger children: after supper, he sung the 136th Psalm, and catechised the elder children and servants; examined them as to what they remembered of the sermons, and concluded the day with prayer. Having a happy constitution both of body and of mind, he went through all this service with constancy and comfort, beside all his ministerial work in public, which he performed without any assistance, and which we now proceed to notice.

Mr. Henry, having chosen the Christian ministry as the grand business of his life, set himself to discharge the duties of it, as soon as he obtained a settlement, with indefatigable industry and with equal delight, being willing to spend and be spent in the service of Christ, and for the good of souls. His stated public services in his own congregation, which were far from the whole of his labors, were such as few other persons could have gone through. His method of proceeding in them was as follows:—

He began the public worship exactly at nine o'clock, with singing the 100th Psalm; then offered a short prayer, and next read some portion of the Old Testament in course, and expounded it in the same manner as appears in his printed Exposition. He went through the Bible twice while he was at Chester, and on his lecture day he expounded all the Psalms not less than five times. After his public exposition was ended, he sung a second time, and prayed for about half an hour. After which he preached about an hour, then prayed, and

usually concluded with singing the 117th Psalm. He pursued the same plan in the afternoon, excepting that he then expounded the New Testament, and at the close sung the 134th Psalm, or some verses of the 136th. In singing, he always made use of David's Psalms, or other Scripture hymns, which he preferred to such as are wholly of human composition, the latter being generally liable to this exception: 'that the fancy is too high, and the matter too low, and sometimes such as a wise and good man may not be able, with entire satisfaction, to offer up as a sacrifice to God.'* In this work of praise he took great delight, as appeared from the manner in which he engaged in it.

In prayer, Mr. Henry's gifts and graces eminently appeared. He had a wonderful faculty of engaging the attention and raising the affections of the worshippers. Though in his second prayer he was always copious, yet he was not tedious. It was always suited to the congregation, to the sermon, to the state of the nation, and to the Church of God. His petitions for the afflicted were very particular, pertinent, and affectionate. In regard to public affairs, he was never guilty of profaning the worship of God by introducing any thing obnoxious to government, or offensive to persons of any party; nor, on the other hand, by giving flattering titles to any description of men. The state of the reformed Churches abroad was much upon his heart, and he was a fervent intercessor for those of them that suffered persecution for righteousness' sake.

How great a talent he had in preaching, is sufficiently known, from the many sermons of his which are before the public. He was very happy in his choice of subjects, and of apposite texts, especially on particular occasions and occurrences, public or private, which he was always ready to improve. His method in his sermons was just and easy; his language plain, sententious, and Scriptural; his elocution natural, and free from any odd or affected tone; his address was popular, earnest, and affectionate; both he himself and his auditory were often transported into tears. The strain of his preaching was spiritual, evangelical, and practical. He shunned not to declare the whole counsel of God. He delighted in preaching Christ and the doctrines of free grace; but with equal zeal he preached up holiness in all its branches, constantly affirming it to be a faithful saying, 'That they who believe in God should be careful to maintain good works.' He was indeed so practical a preacher, and sometimes used such a phraseology in treating on practical subjects, that some have censured him as being too legal; but he was no more of a legalist than the Apostle James, whom he knew well how to reconcile with the Apostle Paul.

It was a common custom with Mr. Henry to preach a series of sermons upon a particular subject, which sometimes took up several years. But he did not follow the practice of several old divines, who delivered a great number of discourses on the same text: his method was, to prevent the tediousness of such a practice, to fix upon different texts for all the different parts of the subject which he discussed. By thus treating upon the various branches of faith and practice in this

* Mr. Henry's judgment and practice in this matter deserves the serious consideration of those who perpetually sing hymns of mere human composition, almost to the exclusion of David's Psalms.

connected view, as well as by his exposition of the Bible in course, his hearers had peculiar advantage for improving in Scripture knowledge, above those whose ministers only discourse upon short detached passages: accordingly it was remarked, that Mr. Henry's people in general greatly excelled in judgment and spiritual understanding.

Mr. Tong has given a list of the subjects which Mr. Henry thus discussed in their connection, which would here occupy too much room. The following is a brief specimen. Soon after he settled at Chester, he delivered a set of sermons on the guilt and misery of an unconverted state, from several texts: in another, he treated on conversions. After these, he preached a series of discourses on a well-ordered conversation, beginning with one on Psalm l, 23. Each sermon contained a distinct direction, grounded on a separate text. A brief sketch of these may be acceptable and useful. 1. Fix a right principle of grace in the heart, 2 Cor. i, 12, latter part. 2. Eye the Gospel of Christ as your great rule, Phil. i, 27. 3. Set the Lord always before you, Psa. xvi, 8. 4. Keep your hearts with all diligence, Prov. iv, 23. 5. Abide under the fear of God, Prov. xxiii, 17. 6. Be not conformed to the world, Rom. xii, 2. 7. Live in constant dependence upon Christ, Col. iii, 17. 8. Take off your affections from present things, 1 John ii, 15. 9. Be always upon your watch, Mark xiii, 37. 10. Keep a conscience void of offence, Acts xxiv, 16. 11. Live by faith, Gal. ii, 20. 12. Commune much with your own hearts, Psa. iv, 4. 13. Watch the door of your lips, Psa. xxxix, 1. 14. Follow the steps of the Lord Jesus, 1 Pet. ii, 21. 15. Set before you the example of the saints, Heb. vi, 12. 16. Be very cautious of your company, Prov. xiii, 20. 17. Make conscience how you spend your time, Eph. v, 16. 18. Pray to God for holy wisdom, James v, 1. 19. Often think of death and judgment, 2 Pet. iii, 11. 20. Converse much with heaven, Phil. iii, 20.

He next delivered a set of sermons for the consolation of God's people, on the covenant of grace: e. g. God in the covenant; a Father—a Husband—a Shepherd—a King, &c. Christ in the covenant; our Righteousness—our Life—our Peace—our Hope: in all His offices; Redeemer, High Priest, Captain, Forerunner, and Friend. The Holy Spirit in the covenant; a Teacher—a Comforter—a Spirit of adoption—an Earnest. Blessings in the covenant; pardon—peace—grace—access to God—ordinances—providences—creatures—death—heaven. These took him nearly a year and a half. He next treated on sanctification, in all its branches; which sermons were followed by another set, on Divine worship, private and public, with various directions concerning each. After this, he delivered another series, on relative duties in all their extent. These, with some others in connection with them, brought him to the year 1698, when he began a body of divinity, which (with occasional discourses) occupied him till the year 1712. Those who wish to see the whole plan, which is very extensive and methodical, are referred to Mr. Tong's life of the author; where may be seen a sketch of his lectures on a week day, and his sacramental discourses.

Another part of Mr. Henry's constant work was catechising, in which he engaged with peculiar delight, from his affection to the young; for which he was eminently qualified, by his happy talent for

adapting his instructions to the weakest capacities. The time which he set apart for this service was the Saturday afternoon, when many beside the catechumens were used to attend, and esteemed it a profitable exercise. He usually spent about an hour in it, and both began and ended with prayer, in which his expressions were very plain and affectionate. He used the Assembly's Catechism with the elder children: but did not content himself with hearing them repeat the answers, but divided them into several short propositions, and put a distinct question to each, explaining every part in a familiar manner, and supporting it by a suitable text of Scripture. His method of catechising may be seen in the addition of the Assembly's Catechism which he published, which is entitled, 'A Scripture Catechism in the method of the Assembly's;' a text of Scripture being annexed to the answer to every subordinate question, grounded on the general answer in that system; by which means children had a large collection of Scripture passages treasured up in their memories.

But we are informed that an excellent and judicious friend of Mr. Henry, 'Mr. Charlton of Manchester, thinking even the shorter catechism of the assembly too long for children, and some parts of it too abstruse, and quite above their capacity, desired and pressed Mr. Henry to draw up a shorter and plainer catechism for children very young,' which accordingly he did; and in the collection of his works it is prefixed to the former. Its title is, 'A plain Catechism for Children.' To which is added, 'Another for the instruction of those who are to be admitted to the Lord's Supper.'

In this work of catechising, Mr. Henry was remarkably blessed of God: for he had the desire of his soul, in seeing the good work of grace begun in many of his young people, in whom he afterward had much pleasure, as they proved honourable and useful members of his Church; though some, of whom he had entertained good hopes, turned out loose and vain, to his unspeakable sorrow.

The ordinance of the Lord's Supper Mr. Henry was used constantly to administer on the first Lord's day in every month, not merely as this was customary in most other Churches, but in conformity to the practice of the Jews, who observed the beginnings of their months as holy, though he did not think their law about the new moons, &c, to be obligatory on Christians. In the manner of administering this ordinance he was particularly excellent, and is said herein to have excelled himself. On his lecture days in the week before the sacrament, he had a series of subjects adapted to that institution. And he followed his father's judgment and practice in encouraging young persons to come to the table of the Lord, to fulfil their baptismal covenant.—Among his catechumens he marked those whom he looked upon as intelligent and serious, with this view; when he had a competent number of such in his eye, he appointed them separately to come to him, to converse with them about their spiritual state; and if he perceived good evidence of their real piety, he recommended it to them to give themselves up to the Lord and His Church. For several Lord's days he catechised them publicly concerning this ordinance; and the week preceding the administration, he preached a sermon adapted to their circumstances, accompanied with suitable prayers for them, and then they were all received into the Church together. This

Mr. P. Henry considered as the proper *confirmation*, or transition into a state of adult and complete Church membership; and his son, in all that was material, adopted his method, in which he had much satisfaction, from observing the great utility of it.

The other positive institution, that of baptism, he administered with equal solemnity, and he always desired to have it in public, unless there was some peculiar reason against it. Mr. Henry had as little of the spirit of a sectarian about him as any man, and he lived in great friendship and affection with many good men, who differed from him in regard to this controverted subject. But he was firm in his opinion about infant baptism, and thought it a matter of no small importance, though by no means one of the essentials of religion; as he considered it to be capable of being applied to very good purpose in a practical view, which was his grand object in his administration of it.

Mr. Tong, in this part of Mr. Henry's life, says, 'His thoughts (upon this subject) he has with great judgment digested, in an excellent treatise, which well deserves to be made public, and I hope will be in a little time. The doctrinal, historical, and practical part of the ordinance are stated and discussed with great perspicuity, seriousness, and spirituality.' The writer of this narrative can attest the justice of Mr. Tong's account of the work, having had the pleasure of perusing the manuscript. It may seem surprising that so elaborate a performance, by so eminent a writer, should have been suffered to lie so long in obscurity; especially as it is written not merely in a controversial manner, but for the most part practical, and very much in the spirit of his 'Treatise on the Lord's Supper.' One chief reason might probably be, its prolixity; and another, his laying on some things more stress than they will bear. These circumstances rendered it highly desirable that the work should be abridged. This was accordingly undertaken, at the urgent desire of some judicious persons who were acquainted with the manuscript, by the Rev. Thomas Robins, when tutor of the academy at Daventry, who had been the pastor of some of the author's descendants, at Westbromwich; and he executed the work with such propriety, that the abridgment is better adapted to answer the worthy author's end, as a useful family book, than the original, and well deserves to be re-published. This treatise is particularly calculated to lead those who approve infant baptism, both parents and children, to make the best practical use of the ordinance.

Visiting the sick Mr. Henry considered as an important part of ministerial duty, and he was diligent in the discharge of it. He never refused to attend the rich or the poor, when sent for, whether they were such as he knew, or strangers, whether resident in the town, or travellers, among whom were many passengers to or from Ireland; or whether they were persons of his own communion, or of the established Church, among the latter of whom many desired his attendance in their illness. He often inquired of his friends whether they knew of any who were sick; and when bills were put up, desiring the prayers of the congregation, he requested that those who sent them would make themselves known, in order that he might properly attend to their cases. His prayers and conversation with sick persons were pertinent, affectionate, and useful. And if they recovered, he assisted them in their expressions of gratitude, reminded them of their sick-bed thoughts and

promises, faithfully exhorting them to improve their renewed lives to the best purposes.

Mr. Henry was considered by his people as a wise and faithful counsellor; they therefore often sent for him, to consult with him on affairs of importance relating to themselves or their families, on which occasions he was always ready to interest himself in their concerns, and to give them his best advice, which he followed with his prayers for their direction and success. But it was not merely on special occasions that he visited his flock; he maintained habitual intercourse with them, and promoted Christian conference among them. Some of the more considerable and intelligent of his congregation had meetings at their own houses, to partake of a friendly entertainment, and enjoy rational and useful conversation. On these occasions, Mr. Henry was usually of the party, and he was one of the best companions in the world. His extensive knowledge, his good sense and ready wit, his cheerfulness of temper, his readiness to communicate what was entertaining and useful, together with his unaffected piety and humility, rendered his conversation highly agreeable; and these interviews contributed greatly to promote knowledge, Christian friendship, and real religion; for they were always closed with prayer, and he had no relish for any visits without it.

But beside these friendly meetings, he had others more stated, especially appointed for Christian conference and prayer, particularly with young persons of his congregation, in which he always presided. The subjects of these conferences 'were not unprofitable questions, or matters of doubtful disputation, but points of faith and cases of conscience; and care was taken to prevent all vain jangling, and whatever might tend to puff up the minds of young people, or make them despise [or envy] one another;' which, as Mr. Tong observes, 'every one who has made the trial, has found to require much wisdom.'—That wisdom Mr. Henry (as appears from his diary) was very desirous to obtain; and as his heart was much set upon this business, so he was very prudent and successful in it.

He was also a great example of ministerial wisdom and fidelity in general. He carefully watched over his flock, and attended with diligence to the respective cases of individuals in it. When he heard an ill report of any, he would go to them, or send for them, and inquire impartially into the truth of the case. If he found the persons guilty, he would deal plainly and faithfully with them in his admonitions, and urge a speedy repentance, in which he was in most instances happily successful; and there were, comparatively, few whom he was obliged to cast out of his Church. When any such case occurred, his diary shows how much his soul was grieved, and what a discouragement it was to him in his ministerial labors. But his sorrow for such awful instances of apostasy was abundantly overbalanced by the joy he felt on the success of the ministry with the far greater part of his people, whom he saw growing up in wisdom and holiness, adorning the doctrine of God their Savior, and strengthening the hands of their pastor.

One uncommon instance of his zeal, and his love to souls, was, the pains he took in visiting the prisoners and malefactors in the jail of Chester castle; which, it is said, he was first led to do on the request of the jailer's wife, who was a pious woman, and was much concerned

at the remissness of those whose province it was to attend these unhappy objects, to whom she showed so much tenderness in other instances, that they yielded to her proposal to send for Mr. Henry to instruct and pray with them. This he did with constancy, and the most tender compassion, for the space of twenty years. And sometimes he preached to them, especially to the condemned malefactors, not without some good appearance of success. The subjects on which he discoursed were admirably appropriate to their condition. At one time three women were under sentence of condemnation for the murder of their bastard children, when he preached on James i, 5: 'Then when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin: and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.' The persons who attended on this occasion (as many were wont to do) were dissolved in tears, and the poor wretches themselves trembled exceedingly. He repeated his visits to them till the day of their execution, and they thanked him for his compassion to their souls; as also many other prisoners did, who were acquitted or pardoned. The last time he performed this humane office, was in the year 1710, when he was sent for by one who was condemned to death, and by the desire of the other prisoners. He had consented to go in the morning, but the curate of St. Mary's, in order to prevent it, sent word that he would go and preach himself, which he accordingly did. However, Mr. Henry went in the evening, and preached respecting the thief upon the cross. Upon which the governor of the castle was prevailed with to interpose, and prevent any more preaching there, except by the proper chaplain; and thus Mr. Henry was discharged from the arduous service which he had so long performed, without any other recompense than the pleasure of doing good to the souls of these wretched creatures, who greatly lamented their loss—a loss which was never made up, for no man in like manner ever cared for their souls.

Another useful service in which Mr. Henry zealously engaged in Chester, (beside many occasional discourses on fast days, and others relative to public affairs, in which he took great interest,) was, his concurrence with the clergy in forming a society for the reformation of manners, similar to that in London. This good work was promoted by the bishop and the dean, who had the interest of religion much at heart. A monthly lecture on a Friday was set up at St. Peter's church, which Mr. Henry constantly attended. The good bishop preached the first sermon, which afforded him great satisfaction. Dr. Fogg, the dean, preached next, on which Mr. Henry writes, 'It was an excellent discourse, much to the purpose. I bless God for this sermon; and as I have from my heart forgiven, so will I endeavor to forget, all that the dean has at any time said against dissenters, and me in particular. Such preaching against sin, and such endeavors to suppress it, will contribute, as much as any thing, to heal differences among those that fear God.' Mr. Henry, the same year, began a course of reformation sermons on his lecture day; and the dissenting ministers in Chester settled a reformation lecture in several parts of the country, the first of which was at Macclesfield, when Mr. Henry preached on the sanctification of the Sabbath. Though the monthly sermons were carried on for some time at St. Peter's in Chester, the good work had many enemies, some of whom began openly to deride

it, and form parties against it. Mr. Henry Newcomb, of Manchester, (though a son of the eminent nonconformist,) in a sermon which he preached at that church, broke out into severe invectives against the dissenters; suggesting, that because they did not conform to the Church, they hardened the profane, and disabled themselves to reform them.—On which Mr. Henry writes, 'The Lord be judge between us: perhaps it will be found that the body of dissenters have been the strongest bulwark against profaneness in England.' The bishop and dean much lamented such obstructions to the work of reformation, but met with such discouragements from the misconduct of those who should have been most active in promoting the design, that at length it was resolved to adjourn this lecture *sine die*. This was matter of much grief to Mr. Henry, but it did not discourage him from proceeding in his own lecture, or uniting with his brethren in adjacent parts, in prosecuting this great object, though they labored under great discouragement, for want of power to enforce the laws against profaneness.

But Mr. Henry's sphere of activity and attempts for usefulness were yet more extensive. Though his own flock was never neglected, he had a care for all the Churches within his line, and readily lent his assistance to his brethren in all the adjacent parts; sometimes taking a compass of thirty miles, preaching every day in the week, but always returning home at the end of it. The towns and villages which lay near Chester enjoyed a large share of his labors, in several of which he had a monthly lecture. Beside attending stated meetings of ministers twice a year, he was frequently called upon to attend ordinations, to preach funeral sermons for his deceased brethren and other respectable persons at a distance: and he never refused complying with invitations to preach on any occasion, when he was able to do it; the great strength of his constitution, and the vigor of his mind, rendering these uncommon exertions easy and pleasant to him.

He was used to take a yearly journey to Nantwich, Newcastle, &c, preaching wherever he came; and another into Lancashire, to preach at Manchester, Chowbent, Warrington, &c, where he was highly valued; but he performed all within the week, choosing to be at any labor or expense rather than not to be with his own people on the Lord's day, from whom he was not absent on that day for ten years together; and never on the first Sabbath in the month, but once, for twenty-four years, and that was when he was in London, after a long absence from it: for though he had many connections in the metropolis, he rarely visited it, as he had no apprehension that his services were there needed so much as in the country, where they had been eminently useful in the revival of religion all around him, both among ministers and people, but particularly in his own congregation, where he had the pleasure of seeing the Redeemer's interest greatly to flourish, and many families rising up to call him blessed.

In the year 1700 Mr. Henry's congregation built a new meeting house for him, which was decent, large, and commodious. On the first opening of it, August 8, he preached an appropriate and excellent sermon on Joshua xxii, 22, 23: 'The Lord God of gods, the Lord God of gods, He knows, and Israel he shall know, if it be in rebellion, or if it be in transgression against the Lord, that we have built an altar.'—This sermon, which is entitled, 'Separation without Rebellion,' was

not published by the author, though fairly transcribed; most probably by reason of his great solicitude to avoid giving offence to any members of the established Church. It was printed in the year 1725, with a preface written by Dr. Watts, who bestows a high encomium upon the author, but hints at 'some expressions in the sermon which may not gain the entire assent of some of his present readers;' referring, doubtless, to what relates to national establishments of religion, to which the worthy author was not averse. It is rather extraordinary that this discourse was not included in the folio edition of Mr. Henry's separate publications, which was printed in the year 1726, in the preface to which it is said, 'that this volume contains them all.' In the year 1781 the writer of this narrative published 'Select Sermons of Mr. Henry,' in a large octavo volume, in which this valuable discourse was inserted.

After the building of this new meeting house, the congregation much increased, especially by the accession of the greatest part of the people that had attended Mr. Harvey, who, in the year 1706, desisted from preaching in Chester, on account of the declining state of his health, and some difficulties about his place of worship; so that Mr. Henry's was now too strait for his hearers, and required a new gallery to be built. It was rather a singular circumstance, that Mr. Harvey's congregation (according to the tradition still current at Chester) occupied this new gallery, and there continued by themselves. But it is presumed that those of them who had been Church members, united with Mr. Henry's Church in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper; for it appears that his Church had considerably increased, so that he had at this time above three hundred and fifty communicants: and he had much comfort in them, as there was great unanimity among them, for which he expressed great thankfulness to God.

This being the case, it may appear matter of surprise and lamentation that he should ever have quitted Chester, and accepted an invitation to a congregation in the vicinity of London. Of this great change, the cause and the consequences of it, an account shall now be given. He had received repeated invitations from congregations in or near London, before that which separated him from his friends at Chester, upon which he put an absolute negative without hesitation. The first of these was soon after his visit to London, in the year 1698. In consequence of his preaching at several principal meetings in the city, for instance, Mr. Doolittle's and Mr. Howe's, he became better known than he had been before, and acquired a considerable degree of fame and reputation as a preacher. It was at this time that he preached the excellent discourse, which was published, on 'Christianity not a Sect, yet every where spoken against.'

The following year a vacancy took place in the congregation at Hackney, (where a great number of wealthy dissenters resided,) by the death of Dr. William Bates, a man of distinguished piety, learning, and abilities, who had refused a bishopric, and would have honored the first episcopal see in the kingdom. The first person thought of to succeed him was Mr. Matthew Henry; and it was unanimously agreed to send him an invitation to become their pastor, though they had no ground to suppose that he was at all dissatisfied with his present situation; and they desired Mr. Shower, an eminent minister at

the Old Jewry, to give him a letter, in order to apprize him of their intention. Mr. Shower accordingly wrote; but Mr. Henry, by the next post, sent a strong negative to the application, assigning, as a principal reason, his affection for the people at Chester, and theirs for him; and he desired that he might have no farther solicitation to leave them. The congregation at Hackney, however, not satisfied with this peremptory answer, wrote to him themselves, and sent him a most pressing invitation to accept their proposal. Mr. Henry, after taking a few days to deliberate upon the matter, wrote them a very respectful letter, in which he gave them a decisive negative, which put an end, for the present, to the negotiation.

But after this, (so lightly have dissenters been wont to view the evil of being *robbers of Churches*,) there was not a considerable vacancy in any London congregation, but Mr. Henry was thought of to fill it. Upon the death of Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, minister of Salters-hall, the people there had their eye upon Mr. Henry, but were discouraged from applying to him, at first, by the negative which he put upon the invitation from Hackney. However, after being disappointed in their expectations from Mr. Chorley of Norwich, and being much divided about an application to another minister, they unanimously agreed to make a vigorous effort to obtain Mr. Henry. Accordingly, letters were written to him by Mr. Howe, Mr. (afterward Dr.) Williams, and Dr. Hamilton, urging this among other arguments, that by coming to this place he would unite both sides, between whom there had been some contests. These letters occasioned him some serious and uneasy thoughts, as appears from his diary, in which he expresses himself willing to be determined by the will of God, if he did but know it, whatever it might be. He afterward takes notice that a dozen of his congregation had been with him to desire that he would not leave them, to whom he answered, that he had once and again given a denial to this invitation, and that it was his present purpose not to leave them, though he could not tell what might happen hereafter.

In the review of this year, he takes particular notice of his invitation to Salters-hall, as what surprised him; and he adds as follows: 'I begged of God to keep me from being lifted up with pride by it. I sought of God the right way. Had I consulted my own fancy, which always had a kindness for London ever since I knew it, or the worldly advantage of my family, I had closed with it. And I was sometimes tempted to think it might open me a door of greater usefulness. I had also reason to think Mr. John Evans [then at Wrexham, afterward Dr. Evans of London, author of the "Christian Temper"] might have been had here, and might have been more acceptable to some, and more useful than I. But I had not courage to break through the opposition of the affections of my friends here to me, and mine to them, nor to venture upon a new and unknown place and work, which I feared myself unfit for. I bless God, I am well satisfied in what I did in that matter. If it ever please God to call me from this place, I depend upon Him to make my way clear. Lord, lead me in a plain path!' No candid person, after reading this, will be disposed to question Mr. Henry's integrity in the future part of his conduct, in quitting Chester, especially considering other invitations from the great city.

In the year 1704, Mr. Henry took another journey to London,

accompanied by Mrs. Henry, to visit two of her sisters then in town, one of whom was dangerously ill. He takes notice of the pleasure he had in hearing Mr. Howe preach, on the morning of June 21. In the afternoon of the same day he preached at Salters-hall, where Mr. Tong was then minister, who mentions his text, Prov. xvi, 16. After visiting many friends, and preaching many sermons, he returned home with great satisfaction, and thankfully recorded some dangers which he had escaped in travelling, the roads being so bad, that in one place the coach was set fast; not apprehending or wishing for another call to the metropolis.

He had hitherto enjoyed a great share of health, but this year he had a very dangerous illness. As he was reading the Scripture on Lord's day morning, August 27, he suddenly fainted away, but soon recovered so as to go on with his work. In the evening, however, feeling himself unwell, he writes, 'A fever is coming upon me; let me be found ready whenever my Lord comes.' He had a very restless night; but, having an appointment at Nantwich the next day, he went and preached on Psalm cx, 3. 'And then,' says he, 'I was well.' The day following, he went to Haslington chapel, to preach the funeral sermon of Mr. Cope, an aged minister, who had spent some years there, and who had requested this of him. Mr. Egerton, the rector, gave his consent. But this, Mr. Henry remarks, was likely to be the last sermon preached there by a dissenter; and it was like to have proved *his* last; for, on his return home, the fever came on with great violence, and confined him for more than three weeks.

It was soon after his recovery from this severe illness, that he began his elaborate work on the Bible. A friend, (Rev. Thomas Stedman, of St. Chads, Shrewsbury,) has communicated the following passage, extracted from his diary, which Mr. Tong had overlooked, but which will appear to most readers both curious and interesting. 'Nov. 12, 1704. This night, after many thoughts of heart, and many prayers concerning it, I began my notes on the Old Testament. 'Tis not likely I should live to finish it; or, if I should, that it should be of [much] public service, for I am not *par negotiis*. Yet, in the strength of God, and I hope with a single eye to His glory, I set about it, that I may be endeavoring something, and spend my time to some good purpose; and let the Lord make what He pleaseth of me. I go about it with fear and trembling, lest *I exercise myself in things too high for me*. The Lord help me to set about it with great humility.' Many passages in his diary, written during the progress of this great work, would be pleasing and edifying to the reader, but the proposed limits of these memoirs forbid the insertion of them.

In the year 1709 Mr. Henry received a letter, dated February 18, informing him that the congregation in which Mr. Howe and Mr. Spademan had been joint pastors, in Silver-street, (both of them now deceased,) had chosen him to succeed the latter, as co-pastor with Mr. Rosewell, and that some of them purposed to go down to Chester to treat with him on this business. He also received many letters from ministers and gentlemen, pressing his acceptance of this call, with a view to his more extensive usefulness. Suffice it to say, he still remained immovable, 'his affection for his people prevailing' (as he ex-

pressed it, in his letter to Mr. Rosewell,) 'above his judgment, interest, and inclination.'

After this, we might naturally have expected to find that Mr. Henry would have ended his days at Chester, and that no society would have attempted to remove him. But the congregation at Hackney being again vacant, by the death of the worthy Mr. Billio, (who died of the smallpox, in the year 1710,) they determined upon renewing their application to Mr. Henry, which they did with increased importunity; and after a long negotiation, and repeated denials, they at length prevailed. As the best justification of his conduct in yielding to their desires, and as a farther illustration of his integrity and piety, as well as his regard to his affectionate friends at Chester, the reader shall have the account of the transaction in his own words, extracted from his diary.

'About midsummer, 1710, I had a letter from the congregation at Hackney, signifying that they had unanimously chosen me to be their minister, and that I should find them as the importunate widow, that would have no nay. I several times denied them. At length they wrote, that some of them would come down hither; to prevent which, (not being unwilling to take a London journey in the interval between my third and fourth volume,) I wrote them word I would come up to them, and did so. Then I laid myself open to the temptation, by increasing my acquaintance in the city. They followed me, after I came down again, with letters to me and the congregation. In October I wrote to them, that if they would stay for me till next spring, (which I was in hopes they would not have done,) I would come up, and make a longer stay, for mutual trial. They wrote, they would wait till then. In May, 1711, I went to them, and stayed till the end of July, and, before I parted with them, signified my acceptance of their invitation, and my purpose to come to them, God willing, the next spring. However, I [should have] denied them, but that Mr. Gunston, Mr. Smith, and some others, came to me from London, and begged me [not to refuse] for the sake of the public—which was the thing that turned the scales. By this determination I have brought upon myself more grief and care than I could have imagined, and have many a time wished it undone; but, having opened my mouth, I could not go back. I did with the utmost impartiality (if I know any thing of myself) beg of God to incline my heart that way which would be most for His glory; and I trust I have a good conscience, willing to be found in the way of my duty. Wherein I have done amiss, the Lord forgive me for Jesus' sake, and make this change concerning the congregation to work together for good to it!'

Another paper, dated Hackney, July 13, 1711, written after fervent prayer to God, contains the reasons which occurred to him why he should accept his invitation, which he wrote to be a satisfaction to him afterward. The following is a brief epitome of them: '1. I am abundantly satisfied that it is lawful for ministers to remove, and in many cases expedient. 2. My invitation to Hackney is not only unanimous, but pressing; and, upon many weeks' trial, I do not perceive any thing discouraging, but every thing that promises comfort and usefulness. 3. There seems an intimation of Providence in the many calls I have had that way before. 4. There is manifestly a

wider door of opportunity to do good opened to me at London than at Chester, which is my main inducement. 5. In drawing up and publishing my Exposition, it will be a great convenience to be near the press —also to have books at hand to consult, and learned men to converse with, for my own improvement. 6. I have followed Providence in this affair, and referred myself to its disposal. 7. I have asked the advice of many ministers, and judicious Christians. 8. I have some reason to hope that my poor endeavors may be more useful to those to whom they are new. 9. I have not been without my discouragements at Chester, which have tempted me to think my work there in a great measure done; many have left us, and few been [of late] added. 10. I am not able to ride long journeys, as formerly, to preach, which last winter brought illness upon me, so that my services would be confined within the walls of Chester. 11. The congregation, though unwilling to part with me, have left the matter under their hands to my own conscience,' &c.

It appears from Mr. Henry's diary, that his journey to London at the time here referred to was very uncomfortable, by reason of the badness of the roads, but especially by his great indisposition and pain, which much discouraged him. 'I begged,' says he, 'that these frequent returning illnesses might be sanctified to me. I see how easily God can break our measures, and disappoint us, and make that tedious which we hoped would be pleasant.' However, he arrived safe, May 12; when he writes thus: 'And now I look back upon the week with thankfulness for the mercies of God, and the rebukes I have been under; such as give me cause to be jealous of myself, whether I be in my way. Lord, show me wherefore thou contendest with me, and wherefore thou relievest me! Lord's day, 13.—I had but a bad night, yet better in the morning. Preached, 2 Pet. i, 4: "Partake of a Divine nature." Administered the Lord's Supper to the congregation at Hackney. Not a hundred communicants.* I was somewhat enlarged in preaching, but at the Lord's Supper very much straitened, and not as I used to be at Chester. 14.—A very good night, and perfectly well, blessed be God. Mr. Tong and Mr. Evans came, and stayed with me most of the day. We talked much to and fro of my coming hither, but brought it to no issue. The congregation seems very unanimous.'

During this visit at Hackney, Mr. Henry preached frequently in the city, and several of his sermons at Salters-hall were published: viz. On Faith in Christ—On Forgiveness of Sin as a Debt—Hope and Fear balanced. Many entertaining articles appear in his journal respecting the visits he made, and the occurrences he met with, during his stay at Hackney, which must be passed over. On the whole, he seems to be better reconciled by it to the thoughts of returning. In one place he says, 'Blessed be God, I meet with a praying people, and that love prayer.' His last entry is July 29.—'Preached, 1 John ii, 25: "This is the promise," &c. Administered the Lord's Supper. We had a very full congregation, which is some encouragement, at

* How much they were increased afterward, does not appear; but it is probable that they were never very numerous, as many dissenters, who live in the villages near London, keep up their connection with the Churches of which they had been members when they resided there.

parting, to think of coming again.' This he did much sooner than he expected; for it appears from his MS. now before me, that, in the next January, he had a subpœna to be a witness in a cause to be tried in the Queen's Bench, which greatly perplexed him. On this occasion he preached at Hackney, January 27, and again on the 30th, being the lecture day; when he writes, that he 'met some of the heads of the congregation, earnestly begging them, with tears, to release him from his promise,' who told him that 'they could not in conscience do it, because they thought his coming was for the public good.' On February 4 he had a fit of the stone. On the 18th he set off very willingly for Chester, and arrived in better health than when he set out. But he had frequent returns of that complaint soon afterward, which however did not occasion him to spare his labors.

The time now approached for him to fulfil his engagement with the people at Hackney, but the thought of leaving his friends at Chester proved a very severe trial to him, and pressed down his spirit beyond measure, as appears from many passages in his diary written about this time. On May 11, 1712, when he took his leave of his flock, he expounded the last chapter of Joshua in the morning, and of Matthew in the afternoon, and preached on 1 Thess. iv, 17, 18. After this service he writes, 'A very sad day—I see I have been unkind to the congregation, who love me too well. May 12.—In much heaviness I set out in the coach for London, not knowing the things that shall befall me there. 15.—Came to London: but Lord, am I in my way? I look back with sorrow for leaving Chester; I look forward with fear; but unto thee, O Lord! do I look up.'

Mr. Henry commenced his pastoral work at Hackney on the Lord's day, May 18. The appearance of the meeting house, which then stood on the opposite side of the way to the present, where three houses now stand, was not very inviting, either without or within. It was an old irregular building, originally formed out of dwelling houses; but it was large, and the congregation was in a flourishing state, both in point of numbers and of wealth; for it is said, no less than thirty gentlemen's carriages constantly attended the meeting, and that the annual collection for the Presbyterian Fund for poor ministers was three hundred pounds. This being the case, it seems surprising that in Mr. Henry's time a better place of worship should not have been erected. What his salary was does not appear, doubtless it was something considerable; but that was with him no object in his removal. His grand motive was usefulness to the Church of God; and of this he had here a very encouraging prospect.

On his first appearance as the minister in this congregation, in the morning he expounded Genesis i, and in the afternoon Matthew i, thus beginning as it were, the world anew. He preached on Acts xvi, 9: 'Come over to Macedonia, and help us.' 'O that good,' says he, 'may be done to precious souls! But I am sad in spirit, lamenting my departure from my friends in Chester. And yet if they be well provided for, I shall be easy, whatever discouragements I may meet with here.'

Mr. Henry conducted his ministerial work at Hackney in much the same manner as he had done at Chester. He began the morning service on the Lord's day, (as the writer has heard some of his hearers

relate,) at nine o'clock. Though the people had not been accustomed to so early an hour, they came into it without reluctance, and many of them were well pleased with it. The only difference in the order of service was, that he began with a short prayer, which it is supposed had been the custom, as it is to this day. In labors he was more abundant here even than he had been at Chester, excepting that he did not now take such frequent journeys, so that he soon made it appear that he did not remove with a view to his own ease and pleasure.—Though his bodily strength was abated, and some disorders began to grow upon him, his zeal and activity continued the same, in expounding, catechising, and preaching, both to his own congregation and in various other places. As he found here a larger field of service, his heart was equally enlarged. He sometimes preached the Lord's-day morning lecture at Little St. Helen's at seven o'clock, and afterward went through the whole of his work at Hackney; and frequently, after both these services at home, he preached the evening lecture to the charity school at Mr. Lloyd's meeting, in Shakspeare's Walk, Wapping; and, at other times, he preached in the evening at Redriff; after which he performed the whole of his family worship as usual. Sometimes he was employed in preaching at one place or other every day in the week, and even twice or thrice on the same day. He showed himself ready to every good work, as if he had a secret impression that his time would be short; and the nearer he came to the end of his course, the swifter was his progress in holiness and all useful services. Nor did he appear to labor in vain, for he had many pleasing proofs of success. He had great encouragement soon after his coming to Hackney, from the usefulness of some sermons which he preached, on Matt. xvi, 26: 'What is a man profited,' &c; many of his hearers were greatly affected, and some of them said they were resolved never to pursue the world so eagerly as they had before done. This was preaching to good purpose.

So many were the calls which Mr. Henry had to preach in and about London, and so ready was he to comply with them, that he sometimes appears in his diary to think that he needed an apology, and to excuse it to himself, that he preached so often. After opening an evening lecture near Shadwell church, January 25, 1712, when his text was Psalm lxxiii, 28, he writes thus: 'I hope, through grace, I can say, the reason why I am so much in my work is, because the love of Christ constrains me, and I find, by experience, it is good for me to draw near to God.'

Beside catechising on Saturday at Hackney, which he began to do the second month after his coming thither, he had a catechetical lecture in London, which he undertook at the request of some serious Christians in the city, but not without the approbation of several of his brethren. Such was his humility, and his respect for the ministers in London, that he declined giving an answer to the proposal till he had consulted them on the subject; when they all expressed their cordial approbation of the design, and several of them, of different denominations, sent their sons to attend his instructions, and often attended themselves. The place fixed upon for this service, was Mr. Wilcox's meeting house, in Monkwell-street, where his tutor, Mr. Doolittle, formerly preached, and had been used to catechise. The time was

Tuesday evening, when considerable numbers, beside the catechumens, were used to attend; and there was great reason to believe that Mr. Henry's labors on these occasions were very useful to numbers of both. It may not be amiss here to introduce an anecdote which he records of a robbery, after one of his evening lectures, for the sake of his pious reflections upon it. As he was coming home,* he was stopped by four men, within half a mile of Hackney, who took from him ten or eleven shillings; upon which he writes, 'What reason have I to be thankful to God, that having travelled so much, I was never robbed before! What abundance of evil this love of money is the root of, that four men should venture their lives and souls for about half a crown apiece! See the vanity of worldly wealth, how soon we may be stript of it, how loose we ought to sit to it.'

Mr. Henry's tender concern for the best interests of young persons, made him very desirous that they might enjoy all proper means for instruction in the knowledge of Divine things. With this view, he exerted himself to increase the number of charity schools, for the promoting of which he drew up the following paper: 'It is humbly proposed that some endeavors may be used to form and maintain charity schools among the dissenters, for the teaching of poor children to read and write, &c, to clothe them, and teach them the Assembly's Catechism. It is thought advisable, and not impracticable.' He then goes on to prove both, and produces a series of arguments at some considerable length, which it is unnecessary here to specify, and answers some objections which might be urged against his plan.

While he was thus laying himself out for the good both of old and young, in and about London, his mind was deeply affected with the state of his congregation at Chester, which was yet destitute of a settled minister; and the disappointment they had met with in their applications to several cost him many prayers and tears. When he took his leave of his old friends, he promised them that he would make them a visit every year, and spend some Sabbaths with them. This his friends at Hackney not only consented to, but recommended. Accordingly, July 20, 1713, he set out on a journey to Chester in the coach, and in his diary he records the particulars of it, with many pious and benevolent remarks, and the sermons which he preached at the different places he visited. An extract may be acceptable, as it discovers his unabated zeal, and his unwearied diligence, in doing good wherever he went; in comparison with which, he says, 'The charge and the trouble of the journey shall be as nothing to me. July 23.—Came to Whitchurch: a wet day, but many friends met me there, to my great reviving. In the afternoon, went to Broad-Oak, and preached from Rom. i, 11: "I long to see you," &c. Next day went to Chester, where my friends received me with much affection and respect. Lord's day, preached from 1 Tim. vi, 12: "Lay hold on eternal life." It was very pleasant for me to preach in the old place, where I have often met with God, and been owned by Him. On Wednesday kept a congregational fast. The next Lord's day preached and administered the Lord's Supper to my beloved flock: a great congregation. Monday went to Middlewich; preached from Matt. xxiv, 12: "Iniquity

* Mr. Tong says, from catechising on Tuesday; but from his own MS. it appears that it was on a Lord's day evening, after preaching at Mr. Rosewell's.

abounds." The next day to Knutsford, to a meeting of ministers: preached from Col. ii, 8: "Though absent in the flesh, yet present in the spirit." Lord's day, August 9, preached at Chester, Titus ii, 13: "Looking for the blessed hope." I took an affectionate farewell of my friends; prayed with many of them: the next day set out, with much ado, for Nantwich, where Mr. Mottershed is well settled: preached from Josh. i, 5, 6: "As I was with Moses, I will be with thee," &c. From thence, that night, went to Wrenbury-wood, and preached there from John i, 48; from thence to Danford, and preached at Whitchurch, on 1 Pet. v, 10; took leave of my dear friends there, and went in the coach alone. Came to London the 15th, and found my tabernacle in peace.'

The following day being the Sabbath, he preached twice at Hackney, as usual, and administered the Lord's Supper. But it appeared that his late great exertions in preaching and travelling were too much for him; so that it was no wonder he should, on the day following, have complained of great weariness, which was attended with drowsiness. Sir Richard Blackmore, being sent for, perceived symptoms of a diabetes, which obliged him to confine himself to the house. The doctor absolutely forbid his going out the next Lord's day; upon which he writes—'A melancholy day: yet not without some communion with God. Perhaps I have been inordinately desirous to be at my study and work again.' By the blessing of God, however, upon the means prescribed, his disorder was removed in a few days after this, and the following Sabbath he went on in his ordinary work.—'Blessed be my God,' says he, 'who carried me through it with ease and pleasure.'

The next month, September 20, he had a severe fit of the stone, and it happened to be on the Lord's day: but it did not prevent his going through his public work. That evening, and the day following, he voided several stones, and rather large ones. He went, however, on the Tuesday, to catechise in London, and on Wednesday preached his weekly lecture at Hackney; on Thursday evening a lecture in Spitalfields, and on Friday joined in the service of a fast, at Mr. Fleming's meeting, at Founder's-hall, where he preached the sermon.—This seemed to be trying his strength beyond the rule of prudence or of duty. However on the Saturday he writes—'I bless God, I have now my health well again.' But the painful disorder several times returned. Early on Lord's day morning, December 13, he was seized with another fit, but the pain went off in about an hour, and, notwithstanding the fatigue it had occasioned, he ventured to London, to preach the morning lecture, before it was light, when he took that text, John xx, 1: 'The first day of the week early, while it was yet dark,' &c; and, after this, he performed the whole service at Hackney. Having related these circumstances, he says—'Blessed be God for help from on high!' On the following Thursday he had another very violent fit of the stone, of which his own account is as follows:—'I went to my study very early, but before seven o'clock I was seized with a fit of the stone, which held me all day: pained and sick, I lay much on the bed, but had comfort in lifting up my heart to God, &c. About five o'clock in the evening I had ease, and about ten I voided a large stone. Though my God caused me grief, yet He had com-

passion. December 18.—Very well to-day, though very ill yesterday. How is this life counterchanged! And yet I am but girding on my harness; the Lord prepare me for the next fit, and the Lord prepare me for the last!'

That period was not now very distant, though none apprehended it to be so near as it proved. Though his constitution was strong, his uncommon exertions must have tended to weaken it; and his close application in his study doubtless occasioned his nephritic complaint. It was also said, by those who knew him at Hackney, that after his settlement there, he yielded to the many invitations he had to sup with his friends, when he was under the temptation, though not to any unbecoming excess, yet to eat and drink what was unfavorable to the health of so studious a man, and one who had been used to a more abstemious mode of life, and had grown corpulent, as his portrait shows him to have been. It is not improbable that this circumstance tended to shorten his days.

At the beginning of this his last year (for so it proved to be) Mr. Henry's mind appears from his diary to have been filled with dark apprehensions, on account of public affairs. The bill which had passed for suppressing the schools of the dissenters he looked upon not only as a heavy grievance in itself, but as a prelude to farther severities. On this occasion he preached an excellent discourse at Mr. Bush's meeting, on 2 Chron. xx, 12: 'Neither know we what to do, but our eyes are up unto thee.'

The following week he took his journey to Chester, from whence he never returned, On May 30, he administered the Lord's Supper, as the best way of parting with his friends at Hackney. In the morning he expounded Exodus xxxviii, in the afternoon Luke vii, and preached on Rev. v, 9: 'For thou wast slain,' &c. On the next day he took the coach for Chester. Mr. Tong, and some other friends, going to Coventry, accompanied him as far as St. Albans, and there they parted with him, never to see his face any more! From a letter to Mrs. Henry, dated June 7, it appeared that he bore the journey well, and that his friends told him he looked better than he did when they saw him the last year. In the same letter he expressed much joy on account of his old congregation being well settled with a minister, with whom he had communicated at the Lord's table the day preceding, much to his satisfaction. With pleasure he remarks—'They had a full communion: none of the congregation are gone off: if none have left it while it was unsettled, I hope none will leave it now.'

From a subsequent article in Mr. Tong's narrative, it appears that Mr. Gardiner was not the sole minister of the congregation, but that a Mr. Withington was united with him. How long the Church and congregation continued in the flourishing state in which Mr. Henry now beheld it, is uncertain; but it is well known that, whatever was the cause, Mr. Gardiner lived to see it greatly decline. This, however, was no just reflection upon him: it has been the common affliction of the best of ministers, especially when they have been advanced in years. Mr. Henry, however, was gone to a better world before the sad change took place, the knowledge of which would have occasioned him inexpressible regret, on the recollection of his being at all accessary to it.

As he continued to interest himself in the welfare of that society to the very last, so likewise he did in whatever concerned the other congregations in that neighborhood, with which he had been so long connected; and in this his last journey he visited several of them, to the great injury of his health: indeed he may be said to have sacrificed his life in their service. On Tuesday, June 8, he went to Wrexham, and, having preached there, returned to Chester that night; he says, 'not at all tired:' but it seems he had some apprehension of a return of the diabetes, and drank some of the Bristol water, by way of prevention. On the 14th he went to visit his brother Warburton, at Grange, and from thence to Knutsford, whither Mr. Gardiner accompanied him, and where he met several of his brethren. From thence he rode, on the Tuesday evening, to Chowbent in Lancashire, and the next day returned to Chester. Though he did not perceive himself to be greatly fatigued, some of his friends could not but fear that he must have injured his health by riding so many miles in so short a time, and by preaching at every place where he came, especially in so hot a summer. Indeed he himself, in a letter written at this time to Mrs. Henry, complains of the heat of the weather, which, he says, made him as faint and feeble as he was when he came up last from the country; and, from a subsequent passage, it seems as if he found himself, after his late hasty tour, far from being well. 'If God bring me home in safety,' says he, 'I believe it will do well to use the means I did last year, unless the return of the cool weather should make it needless; for when I am in the air I am best.' He adds, 'Though I am here among my old friends, yet I find my new ones lie near my heart, among whom God has now cut out my work.'

In the last letter which Mrs. Henry received from him, dated June 19, he informed her that he had taken the coach for Wednesday, the 23d, and that he was to get into it at Whitchurch, from whence he was pleased to think he should have the company of Mr. Yates of that place; and as the following Wednesday was the day for the quarterly fast at Hackney, he expressed his desire that due care might be taken to engage the assistance of some of his brethren.

The next day after he wrote this letter was the Sabbath, which he spent at Chester; and it was the last he spent on earth: a remarkable circumstance, that Providence should so order it that his last labors should be bestowed where they were begun, and where the most of his days had been spent. It was also singular and pleasing that, on his two last Sabbaths in the Church below, he was directed to a subject so peculiarly adapted to the occasion, namely, that of the eternal Sabbath in heaven, on which he was so soon to enter; for on the preceding Lord's day, he had preached twice on Heb. iv, 9: 'There remaineth a rest for the people of God;' which he considered, agreeably to the original, under the idea of a *Sabbath*, which he illustrated in a variety of particulars. On the Lord's day following, he kept the same idea in view, while he treated on that solemn caution, for the improvement of the subject—'Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it.' The circumstances of Mr. Henry's closing his ministry in this remarkable manner, induced Mr. Tong, in his life, to give his readers the substances of both these discourses.

The next day after delivering them he set off, in his journey homeward, without feeling any inconvenience from the past day's labors: indeed he thought he had found relief from his late indisposition, by his excursion to Knutsford and Lancashire; so that he was encouraged (not very prudently) to make an appointment for preaching at Nantwich that day, in his way to London. But all his friends observed that he appeared very heavy and drowsy; though, when asked how he did, he always answered, 'Well.' An apothecary, however, Mr. Sudlow, a good friend of Mr. Henry, said, before he left Chester, they should never see him again. His friends therefore should have dissuaded him from this undertaking, especially on horseback. As he passed Dudden he drank a glass of the mineral water there. Before he came to Torporley, his horse stumbled in a hole, and threw him off. He was a little wet, but said he was not hurt, and felt no inconvenience from the fall. His companions pressed him to alight at Torporley, but he resolved to go on to Nantwich, and there he preached on Jer. xxxi, 18; but all his hearers noticed his want of his usual liveliness, and, after dinner, he was advised to lose a little blood. He consented to this, though he made no complaint of indisposition. After bleeding he fell asleep, and slept so long, that some of his friends thought it right to awaken him, at which he expressed himself rather displeased.

His old intimate friend, Mr. Illidge, was present, who had been desired by Sir Thomas Delves and his lady to invite him to their house, at Doddington, whither their steward was sent to conduct him. But he was not able to proceed any farther, and went to bed at Mr. Mottershed's house, where he felt himself so ill that he said to his friends, 'Pray for me, for now I cannot pray for myself.' While they were putting him to bed, he spoke of the excellence of spiritual comforts in a time of affliction, and blessed God that he enjoyed them. To his friend, Mr. Illidge, he addressed himself in these memorable words: 'You have been used to take notice of the sayings of dying men—this is mine: That a life spent in the service of God, and communion with Him, is the most comfortable and pleasant life that one can live in the present world.' He had a restless night, and about five o'clock on Tuesday morning he was seized with a fit, which his medical attendants agreed to be an apoplexy. He lay speechless, with his eyes fixed, till about eight o'clock, June 22, and then expired.

A near relation of his wrote on this occasion, 'I believe it was most agreeable to him to have so short a passage from his work to his reward. And why should we envy him? It is glorious to die in the service of so great and good a Master, who, we are sure, will not let any of His servants lose by Him.' Yet it cannot but be regretted, that any of them should, by an inordinate zeal, shorten their days, and, by this means, prevent their more lasting usefulness.

On Thursday, before the corpse was removed from Nantwich, Mr. Reynolds, of Salop, preached an excellent sermon on the sad occasion, which was printed. Six ministers accompanied it to Chester, who were met by eight of the clergy, ten coaches, and a great many persons on horseback. Many dissenting ministers followed the mourners, and a universal respect was paid to the deceased by persons of distinction of all denominations. He was buried in Trinity church, in

Chester, where several dear relatives had been laid before him. Mr. Withington delivered a suitable discourse, for the improvement of the providence, at the Thursday lecture, and another on the Lord's day morning after the funeral, as Mr. Gardiner also did in the afternoon, on 2 Kings ii, 12: 'My father, my father,' &c. Mr. Acton, the Baptist minister, took a respectful notice of the loss which the Church had sustained by this event. When the news of his death reached London, it occasioned universal lamentation: there was scarcely a pulpit among the dissenters in which notice was not taken of the breach made in the Church of God: almost every sermon was a funeral sermon for Mr. Henry; and many, who were no friends to the nonconformists, acknowledged that they had lost one who was a great support and honor to their interest. The sermon preached to his congregation at Hackney, July 11, 1714, was by his intimate friend, Mr. William Tong, on John xiii, 36: 'Whither I go thou canst not follow me now; but thou shalt follow me afterward.' This discourse was published, and afterward subjoined to the folio edition of Mr. Henry's Works.

GOSPEL PURITY:

A SERMON, BY THE REV. JOHN LINDSEY,

Of the New-England Conference.

'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God,' 2 Cor. vii, 1.

The simple declaration, that the Gospel is an institution designed by infinite wisdom to redeem mankind from the dominion of sin, is sufficient to inspire the most enlarged expectation of the extent of that salvation which it reveals.

The words I have read in your hearing are taken from that part of the revelation of God's word which was made through one who was an illustrious monument of the power of Divine grace, in the elevation of guilty, fallen, and perishing man.

In the history of the last of the apostles there is exhibited a sudden, rapid, and amazing transition from the lowest state of sin to a height of holiness and wisdom, never yet surpassed by any mortal,—a height so eminent that he is permitted, under the influence of Divine inspiration, to propose himself as a model to the world. 'Follow me, as I follow Christ.' 'Those things, which ye have both learned and received, and heard and seen in me, do.' Even if the text before us were communicated to the Church independently of the rest of Scripture, with what expectation would it influence the mind! 'Having these promises,'—what promises? such promises as furnish ground for the Christian to expect a complete salvation from sin, an entire cleansing from all 'filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' and perfect holiness. This is the interesting and important subject we are to discuss this evening. In doing which we shall endeavor to show,—

I. *What are the nature and extent of the moral purity required in the text.*

First, as to its nature. It is a state of entire holiness, which ex-

cludes from the mind every principle opposing the Divine nature and government.

The terms 'flesh and spirit' comprehend all the faculties of the mind and affections of the heart, in a word, the whole man in his sentient, intellectual, moral and social nature.

This nature, in all its developments previous to regeneration, is unholy. It is, therefore, to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ entirely, that we are indebted for our purification, for all those holy principles, by which the mind acquires a spiritual union with the Deity, and is qualified for the high destinies of the eternal world. This state of purity implies not only a deliverance from that enmity of heart which arrays the whole man against the letter and spirit of the Divine law; but also from that moral and spiritual defilement which extends to every part of the mind.

In this state the soul is not only delivered from the dominion of sin, but is freed from its very existence.

It implies the possession of that gracious power by which the soul moves within the circle of the Divine influence, and perpetually ascends toward Jehovah as the centre of all true purity and bliss. His nature and perfections are its supreme delight. In its objects of approbation and disapprobation, delight and hatred, it is governed by the will of God. That unholy selfishness, which predominated in the mind and presented nothing but a personal interest as the origin and end of every act in life, has been destroyed; and those pure and holy principles actuate the heart, which refer all that is said and done to God as the Judge of all men.

This entire cleansing from all impurity is indispensable to deep and constant communion with God. Every unholy influence leads the mind from God, and in the same proportion as it is followed, as the effect of distance on natural objects, leaves a mist of darkness around his character and government. Hence none of the sublime manifestations of the Divine attributes and perfections, developed in the matchless scheme of redemption, are either discerned or esteemed by such minds; but the visible world and its pursuits constantly engross the attention.

So essential is this entire cleansing from all sin to perfect union with God, that if any degree of moral impurity remain in the heart of a Christian, in every act of devotion and duty in life it will affect his spirit toward God, and however regular he may be in the outward forms of devotion, there will be less of the celestial fervor which should always glow on the altar of the heart.

We now proceed more particularly to consider the extent of this purity. It is not only important that we be holy Christians, but that our holiness extend to all the relations in life, and to all the exercises of the heart. It is not only our duty to be pure in our general Christian character, but to be cleansed from all unrighteousness, that we may perfect holiness in the fear of God.

Our love to God must be pure, free from every mixture of unholy selfishness; above every degree of dissimulation. We should love the Lord our God with all the heart, and with all the soul, mind, and strength.

This pure affection admits no rival. Neither the seduction of sin

nor the fascinations of the world will alienate the affections from the object that is now their supreme delight. To the soul thus elevated by the love of God, wealth has lost its importance; pleasure its attraction; honor its brilliancy; dignity its splendor.

This love admits of no diversion of the different faculties of the mind upon different objects. Under the influence of this Divine principle the soul offers all up to God. The understanding is consecrated to the contemplation of His infinite excellencies; the will to acquiese in His wise dispensations; the affections to adore His matchless goodness; the gifts to extend the glory of His name; and, if needful, the life to advance the honor of His cause.

This love does not admit of any intermission or limitation. It is a living spark from the Divine altar, kindled by the breath of the eternal Spirit, and must be kept constantly glowing in the sanctuary of the heart. It gives the soul a spiritual elevation by which it ascends the third heavens, and reclines on the bosom of Him who fills the throne. It embraces the vast family of man, sympathizes with all their woes, and presents in faith and prayer for its salvation, every undying soul to God.

The universality of this purity is no less manifested in that constant tranquillity which it spreads over the mind. Nothing but moral impurity can excite disquietude and distrust under the government of a wise and good God. Angels and the spirits of just men made perfect are infinitely removed from such painful exercises.

Unshaken confidence in the Divine government secures to those glorified beings a calmness and repose that nothing can disturb.—Neither would our souls ever have been the seat of anxiety and disquietude had they never been stained by pollution. When, therefore, the soul is cleansed from all impurity, and restored entirely to the image of God, it will enjoy an uninterrupted quiet. The Spirit of Christ is sufficient to curb the fierce passions, and soothe the violent tempers. Those causes of disquietude and anxiety which as so many raging winds agitated the mind, are now hushed, and have left the soul to the enjoyment of a sweet calm, under the bright beams of a Savior's love. What can disturb the repose of the mind that possesses this evangelical confidence in God? In the day of heavy calamity there is an oracle announcing, '*All things* shall work for good to them that love God.' When temptations are strong and fierce, it says, 'Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace whose mind is stayed on thee.'

The extent of this moral purity will be manifest in the possession of that patience so closely connected with uniform tranquillity of mind. In no way can the mind of Christ be more clearly developed than in the exemplification of this Christian grace. When it is possessed in all its fulness, then is the Christian 'perfect and entire, wanting nothing.' He is then prepared to glory even in tribulation, knowing that tribulation worketh patience, and patience experience, and experience hope, and hope maketh not ashamed, because the love of God is shed abroad in the heart.

When this Divine purification has been spread throughout the soul, all the family of the Christian graces is perfected; the whole mind is assimilated to God, and all its energies unreservedly consecrated to His service. How can it be otherwise? The Holy Spirit, in the cha-

racter of our comforter and sanctifier, now dwells continually in the heart, and every root of bitterness is eradicated. The whole soul receives the genial influence of the Sun of righteousness, every barren waste is made fertile, and all the plants of holiness are fresh, vigorous, and productive.

This state of moral purity can be nothing less than what the apostle calls 'sanctification of soul, body, and spirit.' It is the extinction of every principle of the heart opposed to Divine holiness; the complete destruction of sin;—'of sin properly so called.'

If by sin we understand those involuntary deviations from that law which was engraven upon the hearts of our first parents in their primitive innocency, then there can be no deliverance from all *sin*. And in view of this law, there cannot be any such thing as sinless purity. But if by sin we mean what our Church terms original or birth sin, 'which is the fault or corruption of the nature of every man which is naturally engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby he is very far gone from original righteousness,' then we are prepared to say that the grace of God totally destroys its existence. What less than this can our text express, 'Cleanse ourselves from *all* filthiness of the *flesh* and *spirit*.' This is indeed to be cleansed from all sin, for where sin exists it must defile. The first and most prominent object of the mediation instituted by Jehovah in Christ, was to take away sin, to cleanse from *all* sin, and thereby to prepare for the reign of grace, 'that where *sin abounded*, there *grace* might much more *abound*. Now, there must be a weakness in the institution, or the object may be accomplished. But there can be no weakness in an institution sustained by omnipotent energy. Every attribute of the Divine mind is concerned in the destruction of sin. What can be too hard for that power that moves on the deep of the depraved mind, and says, 'Let there be purity;' 'Be ye clean through the word which I have spoken unto you?' Now the soul is elevated in all the loveliness of spiritual order and harmony, in all the moral excellency of the Divine image; pure because God is pure.

There are those who believe in the necessity of this state of moral purity, and who expect to attain it in the order in which vegetation reaches its consummation; consequently they do not expect their spiritual harvest until the hour of death. They consider the attainment of sanctification as a consequence resulting from fidelity to God, rather than an instantaneous operation effected by the Eternal Spirit, through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. But this view stands directly opposed to those evangelical sentiments, which assure us that from the commencement to the consummation, salvation is of grace. If this great deliverance depend on our works, then is it no longer of faith, but of works, and boasting, or self commendation, is not excluded. This view necessarily removes the blessing from our immediate grasp, while salvation from sin through Christ is always present; we need not wait to ascend on high, or to go to the deep, behold now is the accepted time for full and entire salvation. Why then must we wait until our earthly course is run before we enter into our spiritual rest? What connection can there be between the corporeal body and the body of sin, by which the latter cannot die unless the former die also? If sin were a natural disease and had its seat in the body, there would be some plausibility in the supposed coincidence; but as its existence is limited to the

mind, no reason can be adduced why the body must die before sin can be exterminated. Nor can we conceive how death can affect our moral habit or spiritual character. It may indeed terminate many ills that 'flesh is heir to,' but to say that it destroys sin and washes out the stains of moral pollution, is not only an outrage on common sense, but a vile insult on the Redeemer, who claims the whole merit of washing us from our sins in His own blood.

II. *Who are those in whom holiness is to be perfected?*

God's regenerate children. Those whom the apostle at the commencement of this epistle calls the 'Church of God.' The exhortation in the text, being addressed to such, implies that those who are God's holy people in their general and prevailing character, are not entirely so. There is remaining in them some 'filthiness of the flesh and spirit.' Their holiness is imperfect, not in quality, but in extent.

We have no intention to undervalue the work of regeneration. The state of a justified person is inexpressibly great and glorious. 'He is born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.' He is a child of God, a member of Christ, and an heir of the kingdom of heaven. The peace of God which passeth all understanding keepeth his heart and mind in Christ Jesus. His very body is a temple of the Holy Ghost; a habitation of God through the Spirit. His heart is purified by faith. He is cleansed from the corruption that is in the world. The love of God is shed abroad in his heart by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto him. He keepeth the commandments of God, and doeth those things that are pleasing in his sight. And he has power over both inward and outward sin. But he is not freed from all sin. This is evident from the plain testimony of Scripture. The author of our text, in speaking to believers, and describing the state of believers in general, says, 'The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other.' He directly affirms that the flesh, evil nature, opposes the Spirit even in believers, so that even in the regenerate there are two principles contrary the one to the other.

Again: when he writes to the believers at Corinth, to those who are in Christ Jesus, he says, 'I brethren could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, as unto babes in Christ. Ye are yet carnal; for whereas there is among you envying and strife, are ye not carnal?' Now here the apostle speaks unto those who were believers, who were in Christ, whom he styles his brethren, as being still in a measure carnal. He affirms that there was envying, an evil temper occasioning strife among them, and yet does not give the least intimation that they had lost their faith. Nay, he manifestly declares that they had not lost their faith: had this been the case they would not have been babes in Christ. And here observe he speaks of being carnal and babes in Christ at one and the same time; plainly showing that every believer is in a degree carnal, while he is only a babe in Christ. Indeed this grand point, that there are two contrary principles in believers, nature and grace, runs through all the epistles of St. Paul; yea, through all the Holy Scriptures.

Almost all the exhortations and directions given in the oracles of God to Christians are founded on this supposition, that wrong tempers and affections exist in those who are, notwithstanding, acknowledged by

the inspired writers to be believers. And they are constantly exhorted to fight and conquer these, by the power of the faith that is in them. Can we doubt that there was faith in the angel of the Church at Ephesus, when our Lord said to him, 'I know thy works, and that thou hast patience, and for my name's sake hast labored, and hast not fainted.' But was there no sin in his heart? There must have been, or Christ could not have added, 'I have somewhat against thee, because thou hast left thy first love.' This was real sin in his heart, of which he was exhorted to repent. And yet we have no authority to say, that, even then, he had no faith. The angel of the Church at Pergamos is also exhorted to repent. This exhortation implies the existence of sin, though concerning him it is expressly said, that he had not denied the faith. But what can be more clear on this subject than the text? This is addressed to the saints at Corinth. Had not the work of purification commenced in them, they could not have been denominated saints; had they been in a state of apostasy, it would not have been said of them, 'who are in Christ.' It is evident they were Christian believers; but they were not cleansed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, consequently sin had existence in them.

The position that there is sin in believers, is not only sustained by the word of God, but is in perfect accordance with the experience of his children. They continually feel the influence of the carnal mind; a tendency to backsliding; a proneness to depart from God, and cleave to things of earth. They are daily sensible of sin remaining in their hearts, pride, self will, unbelief, love of the world; and of sin cleaving to all they speak or do, even their best actions, and holiest duties.—Yet, at the same time, they know that they are of God; they are even enabled to rejoice in the testimony of His Spirit, 'witnessing with their spirit that they are the children of God,' by regeneration and adoption through Christ Jesus, who is now presented for them before the throne of God;—'a Lamb as it had been slain,' and in virtue of the sacrifice they have boldness of access to the throne of grace. But can Christ be in the same heart where sin is? Undoubtedly he can. Otherwise it never would be saved from sin. Where the malady is, there the physician must be. The seat of sin is the heart, and nothing but the presence of Christ can remove it. Christ, indeed, cannot reign where sin reigns; neither will He dwell where sin is allowed. But He is present with, and dwells in the heart of every believer who is vigorously opposing sin, although that heart may not as yet be cleansed from all impurity.

The notion, that in the process of purification we have no positive sin to be saved from, but only a maturity of the Christian graces to attain, is not only unscriptural, and contrary to the experience of the saints, but may be attended with very serious consequences. A devout child of God may become conscious of the existence of some sinful temper or affection; and, under the influence of this error, he naturally draws the conclusion that he has been deceived, or that he is a hypocrite. His soul is grieved and wounded, he throws away his confidence, and becomes a prey to the tempter, and is, perhaps, for ever lost. Having cast away his shield, how can he quench the fiery darts of the devil? How shall he overcome the world, seeing this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith? He stands

disarmed in the midst of his enemies, open to all their assaults. What wonder, then, if he is utterly overthrown, if they take him captive at their will? This cannot be the doctrine of the Gospel, because it would rather hinder than promote the work of God. But as there is a strong disposition manifested to sustain this error, it may not be amiss to notice more particularly the most plausible arguments brought forward in its support.

And first it is said, 'Every believer is born of God, is clean, is holy, is sanctified, is pure in heart, has a new heart, is a temple of the Holy Ghost. Now that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, is altogether good. A man cannot be clean, sanctified, holy, and at the same time unsanctified, unholy. He cannot be pure and impure, or have a new and an old heart together.' Let us now examine this argument part by part. And first, that which is born of the Spirit is spirit, is altogether good. The text we allow, but not the comment. For the text affirms no more than this, that every man who is born of the Spirit, is a spiritual man. He is so as to his general character, and so he may be, and not be altogether spiritual. He may dwell in a spiritual atmosphere, and yet not dwell in the Godhead's brightest rays. The Christians at Corinth were spiritual men, or they never could have been called saints; and yet they were not altogether spiritual. They were still in part carnal; 'but they were fallen from grace.' St. Paul says, they were babes in Christ. To be in Christ is to have a spiritual connection with Him, as the branch is in the vine, as the stone is in the building. 'But a man cannot be clean, sanctified, holy, and at the same time unclean, unsanctified, unholy.' Indeed he may; so the Corinthians were. Ye are washed, says the apostle, ye are sanctified. By sanctification he means a cleansing from outward sin; and yet, in another sense of the word, they were still unsanctified; they were not washed from all filthiness of flesh and spirit; they were not cleansed from envy, evil surmisings, partiality. But most assuredly they could not have a new and an old heart at the same time. Most certainly they had, so far as an old heart implies the remains of an unholy nature. For at that very time their hearts were not entirely renewed. Their carnal mind was nailed to the cross, yet it had not spent its last dying groan; it was a chained captive, but occasionally making a powerful struggle to get free; still it could not gain any advantage while the soul continued watching unto prayer, resting on the altar that sanctifies the gift.

This whole argument, 'If he is clean, he is clean; if he is holy, he is holy,' is really no better than playing upon words. It is the fallacy of arguing from a particular to a general; or of inferring a general conclusion from particular premises. Propose the argument entire, and it runs thus: 'If he is holy in his general character, he is holy altogether.' That does not follow. Every babe in Christ is holy, yet not entirely holy; he is saved from sin, yet not altogether saved from sin; sin remains, though it does not reign. How can any person doubt of the remains of sin in ordinary believers, who has examined the length and breadth of God's law, which requires that we love the Lord our God with all the heart, soul, mind, and strength? Now every deviation from this law is sin. Is there no want of conformity to this law in the heart of believers in general? No man can doubt this, unless he be a stranger to human nature.

But the supposing sin in a believer is frightful and discouraging. It implies the contending with a power that has the possession of our strength, maintains his usurpation of our hearts, and there prosecutes the war in defiance of our Redeemer. Not so. The supposing sin in us does not imply that it has the possession of our strength; no more than a man crucified has the possession of those who crucify him.—'As little does it imply that sin maintains its usurpation of our hearts.' The usurper is dethroned. He remains indeed where he once reigned, but remains under the feet of Him who has conquered all our enemies; becoming weaker and weaker, while the believer goes on from strength to strength, conquering and to conquer. We can come to no other conclusion than that believers, according to the measure of their faith, may be spiritual; yet in a degree carnal. They know they are in Him, and yet find a heart ready to depart from the living God, even an evil heart of unbelief.

From what has been said, we learn the dangerous tendency of the opinion, that we are *wholly* sanctified when we are justified; that our hearts are then cleansed from all sin. This opinion is not an innocent, harmless mistake. It may do *immense* harm. It entirely precludes the possibility of any farther change; for it is manifest, they that are whole do not need a physician, but they that are sick. If we therefore think that we are whole already, there is no occasion to seek for any farther healing. On this supposition, it is absurd to expect a farther deliverance from sin, whether gradual or instantaneous. On the contrary, a deep conviction that we are not yet spiritually whole, that our hearts are not yet entirely purified, that there is yet in us the remains of a carnal mind, which in its nature is enmity to God; that a whole body of sin remains in our hearts, weakened indeed, but not destroyed, shows, beyond all possibility of doubt, the absolute necessity of a farther change. And until believers are fully convinced of the deep corruption of their hearts, they will have but little concern about entire sanctification. They may, possibly, believe that such a thing may be, either at death or some time they know not when, but they have no great uneasiness for want of it, they have no hungering and thirsting to be filled with all the fulness of God. And indeed how can they have until they know themselves better; until Divine light reveals the purity and extent of God's law? By looking into this holy mirror, the soul becomes prepared to exclaim with the prophet, 'Wo is me, for I am undone, for I am a man of unclean lips;' and with the distinguished saint of the land of Ur, to resolve to repent in dust and ashes. This leads us to consider,

III. *How this work is to be accomplished.*

And, first, we are to cleanse ourselves. To cleanse or sanctify often denotes a mere separation from a common to a holy use, to set apart or consecrate to God as His special property, and for His service. Our Lord uses the word in the above sense, when He says, 'For their sakes I sanctify myself.' In order to obtain that purity implied in a cleansing from all filthiness of flesh and spirit, we must set ourselves apart for God in all acts of self denial, watchfulness, and mortification of the deeds of the body.

As the Holy Spirit is the efficient agent by which this great work is wrought, we must deny ourselves all those exercises of the mind and

heart by which He may be grieved. There is a particular state of mind, a temper and sobriety of soul, without which the Spirit of God will not concur in the purification of the heart. It is in our power, through His preventing and assisting grace, to prepare this in ourselves, and, without this preparation, the work cannot be consummated. This preparation consists in preserving a cool and serious disposition of mind, in regulating or calming our affections, and calling in and checking the inordinate pursuits of our passions after the vanities and pleasures of this world. Proper attention to this state of mind is of so much importance that the very reason why men profit so little under the most powerful means, is that they do not look enough within themselves: they do not watch the discords and imperfections of their own spirits, nor attend with care to the directions and remedies which the Holy Spirit is always ready to suggest. Men are generally so much immersed in the hurry of life, in its business, or pleasure, as to leave but little opportunity for that calm reflection, and close examination which is indispensable to the purification of our nature. Nothing is more certain, than that the Holy Spirit will not purify our hearts, unless we carefully attend to this direction.

There are many persons who, in their general deportment, sustain their holy profession, and observe the means of religious improvement with great exactness; but, in the intervals of their devotion, give so much liberty to their thoughts, affections, and discourse, that they seem to adjourn the great business of salvation to the next hour of devotion. In this way they may go in and out of the means of grace, but will not find spiritual communion with God. The work of holiness will not be increased in the heart. By such a course of indulgence, the Holy Spirit is as really grieved as by outward sins. We should not only watch and pray to be saved from the latter, but constantly preserve that frame of mind, suited to the sublime and glorious manifestation of the holy God.

That we may succeed in this great work, we must uniformly observe the means of grace, and most conscientiously regard every duty; cultivate a tender conscience, a rigid exactness in observing the least deviation from the word of God, either in heart or life. Let the constant cry of the soul be,—

> 'O that my tender soul may fly,
> The first abhorr'd approach of ill.'

Consider that we are living under God's eye; that all things are naked and open before Him. Think, and speak, and walk, in view of the awful retributions of eternity. By thus reining up the soul to these spiritual and holy exercises, we shall escape a thousand temptations that otherwise would ensnare our feet; we shall be in a condition, deeply to feel the importance of all that Divine influence which the Holy Spirit imparts. These means and exercises as regularly tend to God, as the sparks fly upward, or the ball tends to the centre of gravity. They cannot be continued in without producing powerful effects.

In all this cleansing, or setting ourselves apart for Christ, we cannot put away sin, or wash out the stains of impurity; we must therefore seek entire sanctification by faith in the atoning blood of Christ. This faith is preceded by a deep sense of the exceeding sinfulness of

sin, by clear and extensive views of a want of conformity to the Divine nature and law. Sins of omission appear now more aggravated in the sight of God than did formerly overt acts of rebellion. The soul now sees inward defects without number: defects of every kind, that they have not the love, the fear, the confidence toward God which they ought to have. They have not the love which is due to their neighbor, to every child of man. They have no holy temper or affection in the degree required. They can no more bear the strict justice of God now than before they believed. This pronounces them to be still worthy of death on all the preceding accounts.

From this state of inward sorrow and sinfulness, the soul has no power to deliver itself. In vain does the subject of justifying grace attempt to expel pride, unbelief, self will, and every other spiritual enemy. The grace given at justification does not extirpate them.—Nor are they ever cast out and destroyed until that faith is exercised by which the soul is entirely sanctified to God. This faith, though not different in its nature, yet it is in its circumstances, from that by which we are justified. Indeed, this is a distinct exercise, and commences a new era in the history of the child of God. This faith has distinct reference to Christ as our sanctifier, in making an end of sin in all its tempers, affections, and pollutions, and transforming the soul entirely into the image of God. In seeking the blessing of justification and regeneration, the blessing of entire sanctification is hardly in our contemplation; it does not come within the range of our faith.—Now, as it is the order of God to bless according to our faith, and only according to our faith, no wonder that those who are real believers in Christ, so long remain destitute of this blessing. Our faith must embrace the glad tidings of this great salvation which God hath prepared for all people. Believe that He, who is the brightness of His Father's glory, the express image of His person, is able to save unto the uttermost all that come unto God through Him. He is able to save you from all the sin which remains in your hearts, from all the sin that cleaves to all your words and actions. He is able to save you from all omissions, and supply all that is wanting in you. He is not only able to do this, but He has promised to do it. Having these promises, let your faith have particular respect unto them while you plead the atoning merit of the great Mediator, and you cannot be disappointed. Believe that you have *now* come to the mount of glorious promise which the enraptured prophet saw, when he exclaimed, '*Then* will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your idols will I cleanse you; a new heart also will I give unto you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart, and I will give you a heart of flesh, and I will put my Spirit within you, and cause you to walk in my statutes, and ye shall keep my judgments and do them.' This is the open door to that fountain of Divine purity where all the stains of sin may be washed out, where you may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, depth and height, where you may know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge, and be filled with all the fulness of God. O, let us come even unto Him who is able and willing to do exceeding abundantly above all that we can ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us. How glorious, how abundant the provision to extinguish all the

fires of sin! In Christ there is merit enough to remove all its guilt; there is power enough to cast out and destroy its very being, and enable the soul to perfect holiness in the fear of God. Christ, to the believer in this great salvation, is wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

Although this work is progressive in believers, it is no less certain that it is instantaneous. There is a time when the soul is entirely sanctified. The fountains of human life may be said gradually to flow out, and, as they flow, the soul approximates nearer and nearer to its dissolution from the body. But there is a definite moment when this dissolution takes place. And there is a definite moment when the body of sin expires; when the believer may say with the apostle, 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me;' when he is indeed dead to sin; when all his nature is sanctified to God. This must be the case, because this blessing is received by faith. Faith is a definite exercise in view of a definite blessing. The very expectation of being sanctified at some future period precludes the possibility of that faith which is indispensable to the immediate reception of the blessing; for this implies unbelief in regard to being now entirely saved. The mind cannot act in relation to two periods at the same time, any more than in relation to two objects. What therefore we are looking for at some future period, we shall not be able to obtain now. Were this work necessarily progressive, so as to prevent our immediate reception of the blessing, then this faith, of which we speak, would be mere presumption, and we should be obliged to bow down to all the unholy affections and tempers peculiar to our state. And the most that we could pray for, in faith, would be, that we might live to witness our spiritual jubilee. How would this paralyze our spiritual energies, and prevent the capabilities of our moral natures from being called out in vigorous action in the glorious work of loving and serving God! Can this result accord with the benevolent and sublime objects of the Gospel? Impossible.

If we give up the present as the day of this great salvation, who can say when it shall be? *Death* may be fixed upon as the period for the consummation of that holiness without which no man shall see God. But what *assurance* have we of such an effect? We have none, unless it can be made to appear that death has some mysterious influence over the mind, by which it purifies from sin. Death is a part of the penalty of the violated law. This agency would make it a part of our redemption. Absurd in the extreme! Some redeeming institution after death may be looked forward to for the salvation of those who are not made holy in this life; such an expectation must involve the same absurdity, inasmuch as all, who die unholy, fall under the curse of the law which knows no mercy. Their sin is the cause of their separation from God; and the cause cannot be destroyed by the effect. We may as well, however, adopt one hypothesis as another. The moment we leave the plain testimony of Scripture, all is conjecture and uncertainty. If the present time is not the time for this great salvation, we can have no assurance that it will ever be accomplished.

That the present is the time for this great work to be wrought, must be obvious from the *object and end of our sanctification.* It is not merely to prepare us for heaven, that holiness is necessary; but to

enable us to show forth the Spirit of Christ in all holy living, perfecting holiness in the fear of God while here on earth.

Christians are active and useful in the service of God in proportion as they are holy, and only in that proportion. It is impossible to calculate what a momentum would be given to the work of God, were all His people holy, harmless, and undefiled. With the most ardent desire and powerful efforts should we be found laboring for the accomplishment of this object.

How many professed Christians are indulging in that supineness and sloth which would lead one to suppose that their highest expectations were to become sufficiently holy to escape future perdition.—How mean, how unworthy the high relation of a child of God are such views and feelings! It should be our inquiry, How much of the Divine mind can I attain? How deep may I sink in the Godhead's sea? How high may I rise in the region of sanctifying love? How may I best answer the end of my being? How may I bring most honor to that Savior who loved me, and gave Himself for me? O, my brethren, were we all absorbed in these important inquiries, all consecrated to the cross of Christ, how soon would the Church become a glorious galaxy that would remove all the darkness of our moral world. Her atmosphere would distil in fertilizing dews on every barren waste.—Her pools would spring up in the dry land. Her glory would fill all the earth. All other means, however well directed, cannot accomplish so much for our degraded and wretched world, as a spiritual, holy, sanctified Church.

Here then we must hold. This is Heaven's high command, 'Be ye holy.' This holiness must fill the earth. Then shall our world be restored to order, harmony, and love. Without this there will be envyings, bickerings, wrath and strife, war and commotion. Holiness is the grand conservative of all that is excellent and glorious; all that is dear to man, and honorable to God; all that can pass unwrecked amidst the wastes of time, and the dissolution of worlds. Holiness is essential to personal and universal happiness. The happiness of heaven could not survive the loss of its holiness. This is the zone that binds the glorified myriads in love and harmony. This is the grand power of heavenly attraction and motion, which fixes them for ever in delightful admiration of the glorious God, and which sacredly impels them forward with the utmost promptitude, energy, and gladness, in the sublime worship and services of immortality. But should the unholy principles of our natures ever once be countenanced, then, in one moment the sun of Divine felicity would be blotted out; the sea of heavenly bliss would roll back; celestial order would be succeeded by a storm of anarchy and confusion which would shake the throne of God itself.

This subject particularly addresses believers in Jesus Christ. What a want is there, my brethren, of that deep and uniform piety which should distinguish the Church of God! I am not prepared to say that there is a less degree of it in the Church now than formerly. No; so far as my observation has extended, I have never known more spirituality, more devotion to Christ, than at the present time. But yet there is much spiritual land to be possessed, there are heights and depths in holiness, that remain to be experienced; pious and benevolent labors

that remain to be accomplished. What a call have we then to gird on the heavenly armor, to lay aside every weight, and to come forth as valiant soldiers in this holy warfare! We see how much our entire holiness is connected with our own individual happiness, and how much it is connected with the enlargement of the Church, the salvation of the world.

It may also address the ministers of Christ. We, my brethren, are, in the providence of God, appointed to stand out on the walls of Zion. We must give an impulse to all the important enterprises of the Church. We must put in motion that pure, that heavenly feeling without which they will ever languish. Eminence in personal piety will always vest a ministry with attractions which nothing else can impart. It is not enough that a minister be holy, he should be eminently holy; he should be as much distinguished by his purity, as by his calling. If, my dear brethren, we have been counted faithful, being put into the ministry, it is of immense importance that we should be examples to the flock, in word, in conversation, in charity, in faith, in purity. We need to live much on the margin of the invisible world! Like Enoch to walk with God; like Abraham to walk by faith, renouncing all confidence in human wisdom; like Paul, though not miraculously, yet spiritually, to be caught up to the third heavens. If we expect our ministry to make a deep impression on the hearts of those who hear us, we must have much communion with God. It is by dwelling in God, and God dwelling in us, that we receive the Divine anointing, without which the sacred robe cannot send out a savory perfume; without this every other attainment is lost, so far as the spiritual character of the Church is concerned. As ministers we must lead in this work, by preaching the doctrine of entire purification, by walking in all purity of mind and heart before God and the world. If we have in any measure neglected this business, let us now put on sackcloth, and bow down before God, and repent in dust and ashes. How many souls may have been hindered in their way to heaven for want of our aid, and it may be some have been turned out of the way. What a thought! may it move our souls, and inspire in our hearts a resolution to consecrate ourselves anew to Christ and our work! O the inconceivable importance of a zealous, pious, sanctified ministry, whose light shall never wane, whose love shall never grow cold, who shall give Jehovah no 'rest,' until Jerusalem be a praise in all the earth! Amen.

MEMOIR OF THE REV. JOHN GROFF.

BY THE REV. JOSEPH HOLDICH.

A HISTORY of the life of Mr. Groff, we doubt not, would afford instruction and comfort to many, had we the materials to form a regular narrative. Of such a biography, from the length of his standing, the utility of his life, and the excellence of his character, he was highly deserving. We cannot but regret, therefore, that so few written memorials of him have been retained. His life would have formed no indifferent history of the Church in his neighborhood, for he became a

member when it was small and feeble in its numbers, was influential in its increase, and personally acquainted with its leading members and principal transactions. We should have seen the growth and expansion of the Church around him, until from 'the least of all seeds, it became a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof.' We might also have witnessed the conflicts of the truth with the peculiar prejudices of that class of society in which he lived, and the pleasing results of its victories. We should have seen the stubborn elements of the German character giving way before the power of the Gospel, and formed by the Holy Spirit into models of Scriptural and ardent, though simple piety. We might also have derived benefit from an exhibition of the disadvantages under which a large portion of that community labor from the peculiarity of their views and habits. The materials, however, for such a narrative, are not in our possession, and we can only furnish his friends and the Church with a brief, and we fear an unsatisfactory notice.

The subject of this brief sketch was born near Strasburg, Lancaster county, Penn., on the 7th of January, 1779. His parents, who possessed considerable property, were descended from the old German settlers, and belonged to the Mennonite persuasion. Of his early life very little has come to our knowledge, except that he grew up without any experimental acquaintance with Christianity, and lived as most other young men do, who have money at command, and liberty to use it as they please. In his twenty-sixth year he was married to Miss Judith Nessly, whose father was one of the first purchasers and settlers in the western part of Virginia. Soon after their marriage they took up their residence in Lancaster county, not far from the place where he first saw the day, and within sight of that in which he closed his eyes.

It was in his thirty-second year that he experienced a saving interest in Christ. He was awakened to a sense of sin and of his lost condition at a camp meeting, and was soon after enabled by faith to embrace the Savior. He was filled with 'peace and joy in believing,' and soon testified his determination to adhere to his principles and profession, by joining the Church, through whose instrumentality he had been brought to God. At first, as might be expected, he met with considerable opposition and persecution. But the excellency and power of his principles soon commended themselves to the approbation even of gainsayers, and the storm gradually calmed away, and left him in perfect peace. About six years after his conversion he felt his heart strongly inclined to call sinners to repentance, and on application was duly licensed as a local preacher by the Rev. Robert R. Roberts, now one of the bishops of the Methodist Church, but who was then presiding elder on that district. He continued to labor in his local sphere as long as his health and strength would allow. His talents as a preacher were not brilliant; nor did he possess those advantages of education which afford grace and elegance to the diction. Yet his mind was of a solid and thinking character; and if his sermons were not characterized by intellectual greatness, at any rate they were not little and contemptible. There was no trick and affectation; no assumption of pretended superiority; no disgusting witticisms, or flights of unsanctified fancy, or sudden questions to bring

forth unexpected answers: those certain marks of a little mind endeavoring to stretch itself beyond its capacity to excite the wonder of the ignorant, but the pity of the well informed. Such were not the sermons of Mr. Groff. He aimed at benefiting his hearers; and he preached plain and Gospel discourses, turned chiefly on the great principles of salvation, and calculated to lead the heart directly to Christ. Not that he undervalued an able exhibition or defence of the higher doctrines of Christianity, or was uninterested himself in such discussions properly conducted; but they did not fall in with his own line of things, and he possessed too much self knowledge to attempt what was not within his proper sphere. Hence his sermons, though unadorned by human graces, were generally profitable to his auditors, because they were always practical and instructive; and satisfactory, because he never undertook what he was unable to perform.

We were also pleased with his commendable modesty in choosing his field of labor. We never saw any thing in him like an ambition to occupy prominent places. He was conscious that he did not possess the qualifications for presenting truth in an attractive garb to highly-cultivated minds, and he preferred laboring where his services would be more beneficial. Neither do we ever remember him to have been chargeable with the weakness of blaming a congregation with slighting the Gospel or the Savior, if they did not happen to be highly pleased with the manner of the preacher. He disdained those petty arts of self love, which would ever maintain its own complacency at the expense of others. Yet he was always acceptable to the congregations for whom he generally labored, who heard him with both pleasure and profit. Indeed, if he had any fault in this particular, it was that of excess in his modesty. Very rarely indeed could he be prevailed on to preach before a large or a remarkably intelligent audience; and very often we have known his diffidence to be distressing where many men, greatly his inferiors, would have felt all possible confidence.

Of his standing in the Church, the best testimony is, the offices he sustained, and the manner in which he filled them. He was not only a local preacher, but for many years class leader and steward of the circuit. He was always found, when able, at his post of duty; and ready to contribute his share of service at the quarterly and camp meetings in his neighborhood. Of late years, however, his infirmities very much circumscribed his labors. They prevented his active services when abroad, and sometimes made him feel as though he was a useless incumbrance. For some years previous to his death he sustained the office of a deacon. For elder's orders he never made application, probably because he believed that doing so would not increase his usefulness. We recollect his once mentioning elder's orders to us, and we gave him candidly our views on the ordination of local preachers. He was too sensible a man to take offence at the freedom, and he abandoned the idea; but whether from our representations or not we do not know. I do not remember that he ever mentioned it again.

In all the relations of domestic life we ever found him upright and exemplary. He was a kind husband, an affectionate father, and a good master. The morning and evening sacrifices were regularly offered on the domestic altar, and he diligently 'trained up' his chil-

dren 'in the way they should go.' To the excellence of his character in this respect strong testimony is found in the sincere grief of his widow and children, and in the fact that out of his five surviving children the four oldest have embraced religion and joined the Church. One who died when but a child became a remarkable instance of early piety and precocious intellect. She died, after a life of extreme suffering, in great peace, and with 'a good hope through grace' of a joyful resurrection.

As a friend and a man we always entertained the highest opinion of Mr. Groff's character. He was always modest and conciliating, but sincere and honest. In manner, it is true, he had at first the appearance of coldness and reserve. But his apparent coldness was only a sincerity that never expressed more than it felt. And as he wasted no words in unnecessary compliment, he expected full credit for all his professions. His reserve was the exercise of a just caution in the formation of intimate acquaintances; a wish to know something of the person before he committed himself too far into his confidence. The apparent distance of his manner too was attributable in no small degree to his natural modesty and self distrust. He did not possess that self confidence and easy assurance, which give to many their fluency and freedom. For our part we esteemed Mr. Groff the more highly for these very qualities, and though they may have prevented him from making very many friends, yet those he had were warm, sincere, and permanent. The writer of this sketch had no inconsiderable opportunity of knowing his value. It is now twelve years since his acquaintance with him commenced. He was at that time appointed to Lancaster circuit. Several members on the circuit thought themselves not very well used in having so youthful a minister. And to some who said it was not just to send a boy to preach to men, Mr. Groff replied, 'Well, if you dont want him, let him come to my house. As long as I live he shall never want a friend.' For this kindness he felt the more indebted because he had no claims on Mr. Groff's hospitality, and he could not possibly be influenced by any but kind and Christian feelings. Accordingly Mr. Groff's house became his home while on the circuit; and from that time he has found there an unchanging welcome and an agreeable resting place. And now that he is departed, he fulfils one of the last requests of his life in recording this imperfect tribute to his worth.

We have frequently admired Mr. Groff's deportment as a private Christian. He was cheerful, but not light; grave, but not morose; sincere, but not blunt: he was affable, without hypocrisy; liberal, without prodigality; and evangelical, without fanaticism. In his house religion always wore an agreeable and an attractive aspect. Even in his pleasantries there was piety, and few could be there long without becoming better men, and entertaining a more sincere regard for his profession. One incident in his life we can hardly forbear relating, both because of its instructive nature, and the illustration it affords of his character. There was a gentleman living in his neighborhood, naturally of high and honorable principles: but who, by being thrown much into coarse and uncongenial society, had fallen into some irregularities. Mr. Groff respected his character, and regretted the course he was pursuing. He invited him to his house, made it as agreeable

to him as possible, and urged him to make his visits as frequent as he should find convenient. Some of Mr. Groff's brethren thought he even went too far in his attentions to a man of his known gayety. But conscious of the purity of his own intentions, he paid no regard to what was said. On a certain occasion his friend was betrayed into some extravagancies which came to Mr. Groff's knowledge. At the next visit he received him as usual, but presently took him into a private apartment, told him what he had heard, exposed to view the tendency of his course, its influence on both his private and his professional character, and on his interests for time and eternity. At the close he added, 'And now, sir, I have told you all, and have done my duty. I hope I have convinced you that I am still your friend.' 'Mr. Groff,' was the reply, 'I believe it, and am very much obliged to you.' It is to be hoped that the advice was not lost upon him. It certainly made no difference in their feelings to each other. But the most complete vindication of Mr. Groff's conduct is the fact, that after a few years he had the satisfaction of seeing this same friend, chiefly through his and his brother's influence, brought to embrace Christ, and together with his excellent lady and several connections become worthy and useful members of the Methodist Church.

Notwithstanding the excellence of Mr. Groff's character, it was his lot, in common with many other sincere Christians, to endure a certain measure of reproach. There are in every community persons of narrow minds and envious tempers, who would bring every man down to their own standard and way of thinking, and seem to have a special grudge against every one who is in superior circumstances to themselves.—Now Mr. Groff was a rich man, his views were more liberal than those of many around him, he gave his children rather better advantages of education, he received more attention from the higher class of society, and in many respects his views were too enlightened to be generally appreciated. No wonder, therefore, that he was the butt of some malevolent spirits, who were willing to make a handle of any thing or nothing, and magnify molehills into mountains. Yet was he, as far as we knew him, an humble and sincere Christian; plain in appearance, unambitious in his pretensions, and unassuming in his deportment.—It was unhappy for him that in the latter part of his life he met with some occurrences of a painful nature. Of these his enemies did not fail to take advantage, and use them to his prejudice, and may possibly have affected the minds of others. We have no means of knowing that this was the fact, but from the nature of the human mind think it not improbable. We know that there is a disposition in most persons to take up things on slight grounds, to judge unfavorably from mere appearances, to listen to evil speaking, however ill grounded, and to pronounce positively on cases they do not at all understand. Be these things, however, as they may, we fully believe that all Mr. Groff's conduct was dictated by principle, and pursued to the best of his judgment. To say that he never erred, would be to say that he was more than human; but to say that he erred from sinful intention, would require a tongue and a heart very unenviable. In all our intercourse with him we never recollect his speaking an unkind word of his enemies, or showing toward them any spirit of resentment. It was very rarely, indeed scarcely ever, that such things were topics of conversation be-

tween us; and when they were he was always ready to acknowledge any error he might have fallen into, and to give to others all the credit they deserved.

We rejoice in being able to add that Mr. Groff's closing scenes furnish a valuable testimony to the power and reality of his principles. For several years he had been gradually declining under the influence of a chronic affection. A twelvemonth before his death his symptoms had assumed a more alarming aspect, but did not confine him entirely to his bed until some time in the summer. The account of his last moments was furnished by his excellent daughter, Mrs. Rebecca G. Wright. 'I was not permitted,' she observes, 'to be with him in his last moments on account of indisposition, but visited him occasionally. The last time I saw him alive he told me, when about to take leave of him, to try and meet him in heaven, "and Rebecca," he added, "seek holiness of heart; do not rest without it." And may God grant that I may soon attain it. Surely it is a happy state, and as I believe it attainable, why not possess it? I think the Methodists, as a people, who profess to believe this doctrine, are too negligent in the pursuit of it. For a few weeks,' she continues, 'before his death his sufferings were extreme, arising mostly from his throat, as he was unable to swallow any thing without much pain. You may judge that in this time his frame was wonderfully wasted: but thank God, as the body failed, the soul strengthened. For about one week before he died his voice failed so much that he could scarcely be understood when he attempted to speak, which was but seldom. But sometimes when his friends would be engaged in prayer with him, his countenance would brighten, and he would raise his hands toward heaven, saying something that could not be understood. He was a pattern of patience, and although so very much reduced, he never once was heard to murmur or repine, and always seemed willing to suffer all for the sake of Christ. On Wednesday afternoon, August 8, he called my mother to read for him the fortieth Psalm, and when she had gone about half through it, he raised his eyes, and with an unearthly smile, said, "All is well!" When she had read the Psalm through, he said, "Read the last verse again." My uncle Abraham, perceiving that he was going, said, "Heaven opens to your view!" at which he bowed his head and died.'

Such was the end of John Groff. As he lived so he died, in 'the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave Himself for him.'—His views of the way of salvation were always clear, and his reliance was entirely upon the atonement and merits of his Savior. As Christ was his sole trust in life, so he was his support in death, and we doubt not is his portion for ever. 'Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his.'

'Full of faith at length he died,
And victorious in the race,
Won the crown for which he died,
Not of merit—but of grace.'

TEMPERANCE REFORMATION.

THE following document brings to light so many appalling facts on the prevalence and evils of intemperance, that we think it worthy of preservation, and therefore give it a place in these columns.

Speech of Mr. Buckingham on the Extent, Causes, and Effects of Drunkenness.

Delivered in the house of commons on Tuesday, June 3, 1834.—As reported in No. XVIII. of Mr. Buckingham's Parliamentary Review.*

SIR,—In rising to call the attention of the house to the motion of which I have given notice, for a select committee to inquire into the extent, causes, and consequences of the great increase of habitual drunkenness among the laboring classes of this kingdom, and to devise legislative measures to prevent its farther spread, I am so fully sensible of the difficulty of the task, that nothing but a strong conviction of its public importance would have induced me to undertake it. In the expositions, which it will be my painful duty to make, I can scarcely fail to encounter the hostility of those who profit largely by the demoralization, of which they are both the cause and the support. In suggesting the remedies which I shall venture to propose, I foresee the opposition of a large class of persons interested in maintaining the existing state of things in all its force; while from those who have no pecuniary interests involved in the inquiry, but who contend, conscientiously, perhaps, that all legislation on such a subject is mischievous, and that the evil should be left to work its own cure, I shall have to endure the imputation of cant and puritanism, in affecting a higher regard for morality than others, of officious meddling, and oppressive interference with the rights of property, and the enjoyments of the laboring classes. For all this I am prepared; and yet, I am indifferent either to the rights of property, or to the enjoyments of my fellow men —and the humbler their class, the more sacredly should their rights and enjoyments be guarded from legislative suppression; but, after years of mature deliberation—after some reading, much reflection, and still more practical experience, grounded on extensive personal obser-

* The following impartial testimony is borne, by a journal of *opposite* political principles, to the merits and character of The Parliamentary Review:—

'Differing as we do on some points with Mr. Buckingham, it is with much pleasure that we avail ourselves of this opportunity to bear our willing testimony to the manliness, independence, and honesty of his character, and his worth to the country (more especially to the maritime and commercial community) as a talented and patriotic statesman. His whole life has been a struggle for freedom—may it be crowned with success! In furtherance of the glorious cause, in which he has so long and so arduously fought, Mr. Buckingham has established a Weekly Parliamentary Review, for the promulgation of the highest and most interesting species of political knowledge, as it comes under his immediate cognizance as a member of parliament; and at the low charge of sixpence per number we have a complete view of the whole of the week's senatorial proceedings, to the extent of *forty pages*. To expatiate on Mr. Buckingham's terse and fascinating style of communicating information, or of the resources of his well-stored mind, would be superfluous at the present day. The periodical before us is one which should be in the hands of every lover of his country, whether whig, tory, or radical.' (*Naval and Military Gazette.*)

vation of the present condition of society in England, Scotland, and Ireland, which, within the last five years, has brought me into close intercourse with many thousands of all ranks and classes—my conviction is as strong as it is sincere, that of all the single evils that afflict our common country, the increased and increasing prevalence of drunkenness, among the laboring classes, including men, women, and children, is the greatest; that it is not only an evil of the greatest magnitude in itself, but that it is the source of a long and melancholy catalogue of other evils springing directly from its impure fountain; and as its daily operation is to sap the very foundations of social happiness and domestic enjoyment, my conviction is, that he who may be instrumental in arresting its fatal progress, will be confering an inestimable benefit on his country, and rendering a valuable service to mankind. (Hear.)

Under this conviction, I propose, sir, with the indulgence of the house, to direct its attention to some few of the causes which appear to me to have been most powerfully operative in extending the increase of drunkenness, and to some few of the baneful effects which it produces, not merely on its immediate victims, but on the best interests of society at large. I shall then, I hope, be able to adduce sufficient reasons to show that legislative interference is imperatively demanded to check the evil, that it is justified by precedent and analogy, and that it will produce the end desired. After this, I will submit to the house the steps which appear to me most likely to operate as immediate checks, as well as others more appropriate to be considered as ulterior remedies for an evil, which it is desirable first to arrest in its present progress; and then, if possible, to root it out and extirpate entirely.

Of the fact of the increase of drunkenness among the laboring classes of the country, I think there will be no doubt. But if there should, a reference to the reports of the police cases, published in any town of the united kingdom, will be more than sufficient to remove such doubts; and if to this be added the evidence furnished by the records of our criminal courts of session or assize, and by the coroners' inquests, hospital returns, and other public documents, accessible to all, the most irresistible proof will be produced to show that intemperance, like a mighty and destroying flood, is fast overwhelming the land. I content myself with two short extracts of evidence on this subject from very different quarters, which I have selected from a mass of others, because they are the shortest and the most recent; not written to serve any special purpose; and above all question as to their authenticity.—The first is from the last official report of the Middlesex Lunatic Asylum, at Hanwell, as published in the *Times* of the present month. It is as follows:—

'Gin Drinking.—The seventy-six deaths which have occurred in the year have been, with the exception of those who have died from advanced age, principally caused by the disease of the brain, of the lungs, and the complaints brought on by those deadly potions of ardent spirits in *which the lower classes seem more than ever to indulge.* In a very great number of the recent cases, both among men and women, the insanity is caused entirely by spirit drinking. This may in some measure be attributed to the young not being taught to consider the practice disgraceful, and to their being tempted, by the gorgeous splendor of the

present gin mansions, to begin a habit which they never would have commenced had they been obliged to steal, fearful of being observed, into the obscurity of the former dram shops.'

The second document to which I beg to draw the special attention of the house, is one of the most appalling, perhaps, that the history of intemperance has ever produced. It is a report of the number of men, women, and children, who entered, for the purpose of procuring ardent spirits, fourteen of the principal gin shops in London and its suburbs: of which there are two in Whitechapel, three at Mile End, one in East Smithfield, one in the Borough, one in Old-street Road, two in Holborn, one in Bloomsbury, and three in Westminster. From these tabular statements I make only the following selections:—At the principal gin shop, in Holborn, there entered on the Monday 2,880 men, 1,855 women, and 289 children, making a total of 5,024 human beings in one single day; and in the whole week 16,988 persons had drank of the poisonous draught from one single house. At the principal gin shop in Whitechapel this had even been exceeded; for there had entered at this house on the Monday no less than 3,146 men, 2,186 women, and 686 children, making a total of 6,021 in a single day; and in the course of the week the numbers amounted to 17,603. The grand total for one week only in the fourteen houses selected, the names of which I have seen, and the localities of which I have myself inspected, amount to no less a number than 269,438, divided in the following proportions, namely, 142,453 men, 108,593 women, and 18,391 children, the women and children united, nearly equalling the men; and surpassing them in the grossness and depravity of their demeanor! Alas! sir, is it England of which we are speaking, the land of the lovely and the brave, the seat of the sciences and the arts, the school of morality and religion; or are those attributes of excellence ascribed to us in mockery, in order to heighten our sense of sorrow and of shame? Yes! in a country second to none in wealth, in intelligence, in power, and I will add, too, in general purity of conduct and character, there yet remains this deadly plague spot, which I call upon the members of this house to assist, to the utmost of their abilities, in endeavoring to wipe away. If this almost inconceivable amount of degradation is produced by fourteen houses only in this metropolis, what must be the mass of vice and immorality engendered by the thousands of other houses of the same class, though of inferior magnitude, which rear their decorated fronts in every street and avenue, which ever way we turn, though, like the whited sepulchres of old, they are—without, all gorgeousness and splendor—within, all rottenness and death; and if the waste, disease, and crime, produced by intoxication in London alone, be thus enormous, what must be the aggregate amount of each in all the other towns and districts of England? The sum is so fearful that I shrink appalled from its bare contemplation. (Hear, hear.)

If we turn to Scotland the prospect is quite as discouraging. From a letter, dated Edinburgh, April, 1834, written by an eminent resident of that city, Dr. Greville, I extract only the following passage:—

'I have been this day in the city chambers, and have ascertained from the official records, that in the royalty (or city) there were issued for the years 1833–4 no less than 736 licenses. The royalty contains

55,232 souls, and 11,046 families; this is, therefore, a license to every fifteenth family. The whole population of Edinburgh and its suburbs is about 166,000; but beyond the royalty the licenses are mixed up with those of the country, and it is not so easy to obtain a distinct account of them. This, however, is well known, that three years ago there were only 1,700 licenses in the whole of this district; so that the increase in that short space of time is enormous.'

If we ask whether Ireland is affected with this deadly plague as well as Scotland and England, the answer must unfortunately be in the affirmative. In Dublin and in Cork the increased consumption of ardent spirits, and the consequent increase of disease and crime is undeniable, and testimonies might be multiplied on this subject to any required extent. But to take the north of Ireland, rather than the south, for an example, as the north is universally admitted to be in a higher state of order, and peace, and comfort, than the south, I quote a single passage, from a report drawn up by the Rev. John Edgar, divinity professor in the Royal college of Belfast, dated in January of the present year, in which he says,—

'The demand for spirituous liquors is so universal that spirit shops in the town of Ulster average sixteen, eighteen, and even thirty, to one baker's shop: and in some villages every shop is a spirit shop. In one town, containing only eight hundred houses, there are no less than eighty-eight spirit shops. The fruit of all this exhibits itself every where, in the destruction of property, and peace, and health, and life, and happiness; in the increase of crime, the injury of the best interests of individuals, of families, and of the community at large.'

Subsequently to the date of this report, I have received a letter from Mr. John Finch, of Liverpool, a gentlemen well known for his intimate acquaintance with the lower orders of the people generally, from his having made their condition the subject of personal investigation and continued care. He says,—

'I have just returned from a six weeks' journey in Ireland, having visited all the principal seaports in that island, from the Giant's Causeway to Bantry and Wexford, and certainly the condition of the great mass of the people in that country is as miserable as it is possible; they are filthy, ragged, famished, houseless, herding with pigs, and sleeping on dunghills, without regular employment, and working for sixpence, and even fourpence and fivepence per day. No doubt this wretchedness is in part owing to absenteeism, want of leases, high rents, and in *some trifling degree* to tithes; but I feel satisfied that drunkenness and whisky drinking are a greater curse than all these put together. Do you ask for proof? The finest mansions, parks, and farms in Ireland belong to distillers and brewers; the largest manufactories are distilleries and breweries, and at least one out of every four or five shops in Ireland is a dram or beer shop: in one street in Belfast I counted seven whisky shops together, on one side of the street; one of the poor law commissioners told me at Waterford, that it had just been ascertained that 50,000*l.* worth of whisky and other intoxicating liquors were sold at Clonmel in the retail shops last year, with a population of about 15,000; and it was believed that in Waterford, with a population of about 30,000, nearly 100,000*l.* worth was sold in the same time. It is true these are market towns of great resort, and

therefore it is not to be supposed that it was all drunk by residents. Can we wonder then that the Irish people are so poor? I believe nothing can be done for their relief, unless means be first adopted to check this dreadful evil.'

In the central parts of England, in the great manufacturing towns of Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, and their surrounding districts, the evil is widely extending in every direction. In Manchester and the surrounding towns of Bolton, Stockport, Oldham, and others, the increase of spirit shops and spirit drinkers is greater perhaps than in any part of England. Take the following testimony as to the former, from the excellent work of Dr. Kay, an eminent physician of that town, On the Condition of the Working Classes:—

'Some idea,' he says, 'may be formed of the influence of these establishments, the gin shops, on the health and morals of the people, from the following statement, for which I am indebted to Mr. Braidley, the boroughreeve of Manchester. He observed the number of persons entering a single gin shop in five minutes, during eight successive Saturday evenings, and at various periods, from seven o'clock till ten. The average result was 112 men, and 163 women, or 275 in forty minutes, which is equal to 412 per hour.'

Mr. Robert Jowitt, a most respectable merchant and manufacturer of Leeds, states, that according to the official returns there were no less than 297 hotels, inns, and taverns, licensed in that borough alone; beside 289 beer shops, making in the whole 586 houses furnishing intoxicating drinks, in which, calculating the receipts of the former as on the average of 17*l.*, and of the latter on the average of 3*l.* per week only, there would be expended the sum of 307,632*l.* per annum; and by far the largest proportion of this paid by the working people.

In the Sheffield Iris, of the 17th of May, but a few weeks ago, is the following paragraph, which, though short, speaks volumes, as to the fearful increase of intemperance in the great district of which it is the centre. The paragraph is most appropriately headed, and is as follows:—

'The Intoxicating March to Death.—It is a painful, but at the same time a most melancholy fact, that Mr. Badger, the coroner of this district, has, within the short space of ten days, had occasion to hold inquests on thirteen persons who have come to their deaths by accidents solely arising from indulging in the baneful vice of drunkenness.' (Hear, hear.)

Sir, it would be easy to multiply evidence of this description to any extent required. But I refrain from adducing any more. Here, in the immediate precincts of the seat of legislation, under the venerable shadow of Westminster Abbey, as well as in other parts of this great metropolis; in Holborn and Seven Dials, on the north; in Southwark and St. George's fields, in the south; in Whitechapel and Mile End, in the east; in the Strand, in Piccadilly, and in Oxford-street, in the west; as well as Smithfield, Barbican, and Shoreditch, in the centre; every where, in every direction, in the heart, and around the suburbs of this mighty city, the demon of intoxication seems to sweep all before him with his fiery flood, while in the remotest villages and hamlets of the country, as well as in the manufacturing towns, the evil has increased, is increasing, and cries with a loud voice from every quarter for redress.

From the melancholy facts of the case, I pass for a moment to consider what appear to me to have been among the causes of this increased drunkenness among the humbler classes. The first of these I take to be the early example of their superiors in the higher classes of society, among whom, in periods not very remote, drinking to excess was so far from being regarded as a vice, that it was often boasted of as a sort of prowess, worthy of distinction and honor, when no entertainment was considered to be hospitably concluded without the intoxication of the majority of those who partook of it, when ladies were obliged to quit the dinner table to prevent their being shocked by the excesses of the gentlemen who remained; and when the liberality of the host was tested by the number of the guests he had made drunk at his cost. Happily, for the better-educated classes of society, this state of things, which many honorable members whom I now address are old enough, no doubt, to remember, has passed away from them. But drunken servants began at length to imitate drunken masters; and intoxication being regarded as a proof of gentility and spirit, and a sign of property or credit in the drinker, the vice soon spread lower and lower in the ranks of society, just as any other bad habit, whether of dress or manners, after having been discarded by the upper ranks, with whom it first originated, descends progressively to their inferiors.

Another cause has been undoubtedly the severe pressure of taxation, and the equally severe pressure of that excessive labor, by which alone a poor man could hope to find subsistence. These two causes, operating conjointly, rendered it almost impossible for laboring men to provide themselves with homes of comfort, and therefore the blazing fire and easy chair of the tap room at the public house possessed a more powerful attraction for them than an empty hearth, a damp floor, and a cold and comfortless lodging. They could not enter into this comfortable retreat without drinking something: the first glass begat only a thirst for the second: smoking was added by the landlord, to increase still more the thirst which he profited by quenching; and associates in all vicious habits commending each other, for the purpose of quieting the reproaches of conscience, the moderate drinker looked indulgently on the drunkard till he became tainted with the destructive habit himself. The large size of the towns, increasing in every direction, making the old rural sports of England more and more difficult of access, and the lengthened hours of labor affording less time for healthful recreation, and forcing men to those more quickly-excited pleasures of intoxication, were, no doubt, each auxiliaries to the causes I have described in towns; while the departure from the old and wholesome custom of farmers entertaining their laboring men beneath their own roofs, produced the same result of driving them to pass their evenings at public houses in the country.

Another cause may perhaps be found in the sanction given to the sale of spirits by a government license, which took away from the traffic the disrepute which would, no doubt, otherwise have attached to it, if not so authorized. The government, deriving a large revenue from this source, again looked favorably even on the excesses which itself had in some measure created; and the large sums which flowed annually into the exchequer, by the increased consumption of ardent

spirits, made them encourage rather than repress the disposition in the people to swell the treasury through this productive channel. The duties were therefore continually augmented, until they reached their maximum. This augmentation led to smuggling; and as the tax which the smuggler evaded was regarded as a hinderance to the enjoyment of the people, public sympathy ran rather with the violators than with the observers of the law. The smuggler became every where a welcome visitor. The rich and the middle classes, as well as the poor, delighted in cheating the government by purchasing a contraband commodity. The very risk and secrecy of the transaction gave additional zest to its fruits. Spirit drinking accordingly increased extensively, and while legal distilleries were encouraged for the aid they gave to the treasury, illicit distillation, and unlawful importation, was encouraged by high duties; while the sellers of each left no exertion untried to increase the taste for a beverage, the sale of which brought them such large profits, and which, in its seductive nature was calculated, if it could be but once implanted, to go on creating a vitiated appetite, which would grow by what it fed on, and know no bounds to its continued augmentation, till it destroyed its victim by his own excess.

To meet the increased demand engendered by this increased dissipation, new houses of entertainment sprung up in every direction, in the shape of wine vaults and gin shops in the large seaports and manufacturing districts, and taverns and ale houses in the agricultural provinces. The government, too, instead of checking the evil, added only fresh fuel to the already too rapidly devouring flame; and the reduction of the duty on ardent spirits on the one hand, and the increased facilities given to the sale of beer on the other, spread a flood of desolation over the whole surface of the country, which, departing from the mighty heart of the metropolis, was circulated in all the arteries and veins to the utmost extremities of the frame; and has been thence rolled back again in a torrent of such wide-spreading devastation, that it has scarcely left a single spot uninundated by its overwhelming waves. (Hear, hear.)

Let us seriously ask ourselves what have been the effects of all this. Alas! sir, the answer is indeed a melancholy one. Deterioration of the public health, to such a degree that our hospitals and asylums are filled with the victims of intemperance. Increase of pauperism in every parish, so that the poor rates bid fair to exceed the rental of the land. Destruction of public morals, by the brutalization of the old, and the prostitution of the young; the extinction of all honest pride of independence in the men, and the annihilation of all sense of decency in the women; the neglect of wives by their husbands, of children by their parents; and the breaking in sunder all those soft and endearing ties which heretofore were recognized as sacred among the humblest classes in society. These are but the outlines of this great chart of misery and degradation which drunkenness has traced out for our survey: the details are too full of sickening horror to be painted by any pen or uttered by any tongue: they must be seen to be credited, and witnessed before they can be felt in all their force.

As a matter of public economy, the lowest and the narrowest light in which it can be viewed, let a calculation be made of the national

cost of all this evil, and it will be seen that if the revenue derived from it were ten times its present amount, it would be far outbalanced by the tremendous loss which it inflicts on the nation. It is estimated, on carefully-collected data, that not less than fifty millions sterling is expended in a single year, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, in spirits, wine, beer, and other intoxicating and fermented drinks; not a single drop of which is necessary, either for the health or strength of man, but every glass of which is, in its degree, absolutely prejudicial to the consumer. Here, then, is fifty millions of capital wasted; a sum equal to the revenue of the whole kingdom as much thrown away as if it were sunk in the depths of the Atlantic. Nay, worse than that; for then it would be merely lost, and no more; but, from its being expended in intoxicating drinks, it gives rise to a long train of expenses beside. Of these, the hospitals and lunatic asylums may be put down at two millions; the country jails and town prisons, river hulks and convict transports, with all the machinery of police and criminal jurisdiction, whether military or civil, for both are used, may be reckoned at five millions more; and the absolute destruction of property, in the burning of houses and their contents, the shipwreck of vessels, and the spoiling, and rendering useless, goods of various kinds, destroyed by neglect, may be estimated as at least three millions more. Let us add to this the immense loss of time and productive labor, which will equal the sixty millions already enumerated. In a calculation that was made, of the loss of wages, and consequently of productive labor worth those wages in amount, sustained by the members of the Trades' Unions, when they devoted a single day only to a procession through London, it was estimated that the loss in wages by the whole number of those who either formed part of that procession, or lost their day by the suspension of business in all the parts through which they passed, and the absence from their homes of those who accompanied it, was, at the least, 50,000*l.* Now, from the great prevalence of the habit of congregating to drink in parties on the Sunday, the Monday, and sometimes even on the Tuesday in each week, it may be safely calculated that there is one such day as this lost in every town in the kingdom every week in the year. Supposing London alone then, with its 1,500,000 inhabitants, to lose 50,000*l.* by the very partial suspension of its trade and productive labor in one week; fifty-two such weekly losses would exceed two millions and a half per annum, and reckoning London as one-twentieth part of the whole kingdom, this would be forty-five millions for the whole. It may be therefore asserted, without fear of contradiction, that the aggregate expenses entailed, and losses sustained, by the pernicious habits of drinking, exceed one hundred millions annually; that, in a mere pecuniary and economical sense, it is the greatest blight that ever cursed our country; and like the canker worm, it is eating out its very vitals. (Hear.)

There is another consideration connected with the economical part of the question, which ought not to be overlooked. Among the various public questions which deeply engage the minds of all classes, there is not one, perhaps, of more general interest than that of the importance of increasing the quantity and lessening the price of food to the laboring classes. Let us see for a moment how this increased use of ardent spirits and intoxicating drink operates in that particular. The

quantity of British made spirits (quite exclusive of foreign importations) has greatly exceeded twenty millions of gallons on the average of several years past, and now exceeds twenty-seven millions, having increased more than one third within a very short space of time. This increased consumption of spirits, I remember to have heard cited on one occasion, by the right hon. the secretary of the treasury, (Mr. Spring Rice,) as a proof of the increased prosperity of Ireland, so exclusively is the treasury idea of prosperity confined to the proof of money coming into the exchequer, though that may be caused by the very impoverishment and misery of the people. But let us see how this increased consumption of ardent spirits decreases the supply of human food. It requires one bushel of grain to make two gallons of spirits; so that taking the legally-distilled spirits made at home at twenty-seven millions of gallons, and the illegally-distilled spirits at half that quantity, and in Scotland and Ireland it is much more, these forty millions of distilled spirits would consume twenty millions of bushels of grain in a year. Here, then, is not merely a waste and destruction of that very food of which the laboring classes of England have not enough, and which they are demanding to be admitted from foreign countries, duty free; but it is a conversion of one of the best gifts of Providence—a wholesome and nutritious article of sustenance into a fiery flood of disease, of crime, and of physical and mental destruction. We hang by the hands of the common executioner, the ignorant rick burner, who destroys the hay or straw laid up for the winter food of cattle; while we encourage and enrich the distiller and the vender of that far more destructive fire, which consumes twenty millions of bushels of the best food of man, which spreads its extirminating lava over the whole surface of society, which kills the body, which destroys the soul, and leaves no one redeeming or even palliating trace behind it.

That the use of these drinks is not, in the slightest degree, necessary to health or strength, may be proved by the habits and condition of the people in other lands, and by the testimonies of personal experience and professional eminence in our own. In Turkey, in Persia, in Bokhara and Samarcand, which, though Mohammedan countries, have snow and ice during a large part of the year, and a climate more severe in many parts, during the winter, even than our own, the people use no stronger drinks than water, milk, and sherbet, a kind of pleasant lemonade, without the least admixture of fermented or spirituous ingredients; and in health, strength, and beauty, they rank the first among the nations of the world. The pehlevans, or athletæ, of Persia, as well as the wrestlers and quoit players of Upper Hindoostan, are among the most muscular and powerful men that I have ever seen—before whom the strongest European would quail; and these drink nothing stronger than water. In my own journeys, during one of which I rode upward of eight hundred miles on horseback, in ten successive days, or more than eighty miles a day, in Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, with the thermometer at the burning heat of one hundred and twenty-five degrees in some parts of the journey, and below the freezing point in others, I drank only water, and still continue that pure and wholesome beverage, in the enjoyment of a health and strength, and capacity to sustain fatigue, such as, if my beverage were either beer, or wine,

or spirits, I could not possibly enjoy. Nor am I a singular instance; for I have the pleasure to know many, who, having made the same experiment, and finding its benefit, have had the courage and the firmness to persevere in its practice, amidst the scoffs and sarcasms of the world. On this subject, however, the following testimony, signed by no less a number than five hundred and eighty-nine medical men of the first eminence, in the principal towns of the kingdom, is at once conclusive and irresistible:—

'We, the undersigned, do hereby declare that, in our opinion, ardent spirits cannot be regarded as a necessary, suitable, or nourishing article of diet; that they have not the property of preventing the accession of any complaints, but may be considered as the principal source of numerous and formidable diseases, and the principal cause of the poverty, crime, and misery, which abound in this country; and that the entire disuse of them, except under medical direction, would materially tend to improve the health, amend the morals, and augment the comfort of the community.'

Let me add to this the individual opinions of the following eminent members of the medical profession, in London, Edinburgh, and Dublin.

Sir. Astley Cooper, Bart., principal surgeon to the king, says,—'No person has a greater hostility to dram drinking than myself, insomuch that I never suffer any ardent spirits in my house, thinking them *evil spirits;* and if the poor could witness the white livers, the dropsies, the shattered nervous systems which I have seen, as the consequences of drinking, they would be aware that spirits and poisons were synonymous terms.'

William Harty, physician to the prison of Dublin, says,—'Being thoroughly convinced, by long and extensive observation among the poor and middling classes, that there does not exist a more productive cause of disease, and consequent poverty and wretchedness, than the habitual use of ardent spirits, I cannot therefore hesitate to recommend the *entire* disuse of such a poison, rather than incur the risks necessarily connected with its most moderate use.'

Robert Christison, professor of materia medica in the university of Edinburgh, says,—'The useful purposes to be served by spirituous liquors are so trifling, contrasted with the immense magnitude and variety of the evils resulting from their habitual abuse by the working classes of this country, that their entire abandonment as an article of diet is earnestly to be desired. According to my experience in the infirmary of this city, the effects of the abuse of ardent spirits in impairing health, and adding to the general mortality, are much increased in Edinburgh since the late changes in the excise laws, and the subsequent cheapness of whisky.'

Edward Turner, professor of chemistry in the London university, says,—'It is my firm conviction that ardent spirits are not a nourishing article of diet; that in this climate they may be entirely disused, except as a medicine, with advantage to health and strength; and that their habitual use tends to undermine the constitution, enfeeble the mind, and degrade the character. They are one of the principal causes of disease, poverty, and vice.'

I cannot forbear adding to this, the fact of two experiments having been recently tried, one among the anchor smiths in one of the king's

dockyards, and another among the furnace men, or smelters of tin ore, in Cornwall. As in each of these occupations the heat of the fires is excessive, and the labor great, it had been always hitherto considered necessary to grant an unlimited supply of beer to the persons engaged in it. But a party of each were prevailed upon, for a sum of money divided among them, to try the experiment of working a gang of water drinkers against one of beer drinkers, each equal in number and average strength; and the result of both the experiments went to prove that the water drinkers could sustain the greatest degree of heat and labor with the least exhaustion or inconvenience. This is the case in England. I will add only a short paragraph from the valuable testimony of a well-known authority, Henry Marshall, Esq., deputy inspector general of army hospitals. In a valuable paper on the impolicy of issuing ardent spirits to the European troops in India, he says,—

'The first error, with respect to the use of ardent spirits, which I mean to oppose, is, that they contribute to enable men to undergo great fatigue. This is, I believe, a very common error. Spirits never add permanent strength to any person. In all climates the temperate livers are the fittest to endure fatigue. Dr. Jackson travelled one hundred and eighteen miles in Jamaica in four days, and carried baggage equal in weight to the common knapsack of a soldier. He says, "In the journey which I have just now mentioned, I probably owe my escape from sickness to temperance and spare diet. I breakfasted on tea about ten in the morning, and made a meal of bread and salad after I had taken up my lodging for the night. If I had occasion to drink through the day, water or lemonade was my beverage." He concludes his observations on this topic by stating, "I have introduced my own experience on the present occasion, because it enables me to speak from conviction, that an English soldier may be rendered capable of going through the severest military service in the West Indies, and that temperance will be one of the best means of enabling him to perform his duty with safety and effect." Personal experience has taught me that the use of ardent spirits is not necessary to enable a European to undergo the fatigue of marching in a climate whose mean temperature is between 73° and 80°, as I have often marched on foot, and been employed in the operations of the field with troops in such a climate, without any other beverage than water and coffee. So far from being calculated to assist the human body in enduring fatigue, I have always found that the strongest liquors were the most enervating, and this in whatever quantity they were consumed; for the daily use of spirits is an evil habit which retains its pernicious character through all its gradations. Indulged in at all, it can produce nothing better than a more diluted or mitigated degree of mischief.'

Let the following short testimonies of three eminent physicians, Dr. Rush, in America, Dr. Trotter, physician to the fleet, and one of the most experienced medical men ever possessed by the navy of England, and Dr. Paris, a gentleman of extensive practice in London, be added; and the evidence on this branch of the subject will be complete.

Dr. Rush says: 'Since the introduction of spirituous liquors into such general use, physicians have remarked, that a number of diseases have appeared among us, and have described many new symptoms as

common to all diseases.' Dr. Trotter says: 'Amidst all the evils of human life, no cause of disease has so wide a range, or so large a share, as the use of spirits. Spirituous liquors,' he adds, 'destroy more lives than the sword; war has its intervals of destruction, but spirits operate at all times and seasons upon human life.' And Dr. Paris says, that 'the art of extracting alcoholic liquors by distillation, must be regarded as the greatest curse inflicted on human nature.'

Notwithstanding this, with an infatuation most blind and besotted, and too much, I regret to say, fostered and encouraged by those of their superiors, who talk of the 'comfort and refreshment' which these deadly poisons afford to the laboring classes, we see the town and country population, with sickly countenances, sunken eyes, pallid cheeks, livid lips, enfeebled knees, palsied heads, and tremulous hands, absolutely diminishing in stature, and becoming uglier in feature; begetting a progeny which, beside partaking of the diseased constitution of their parents, are initiated into the use of the insidious poison in their very infancy, by their wretched mothers, and are growing up more feeble in bodily strength, more weak in mental power, and more vicious and degraded in moral conduct, than even their parents themselves, to whom they are inferior in physical stamina, but whom they exceed in self abandonment and dissipation.

There are some, however, who, though they admit the injurious effects produced by the general habit of intemperance, deny that the habit itself has increased; and for their conviction I venture to adduce the following remarkable facts, taken from a very valuable little work, published only four years ago, entitled, 'An Inquiry into the Influence of the excessive Use of Spirituous Liquors in producing Crime, Disease and Poverty in Ireland;' compiled from the most authentic and official documents, and exhibiting most remarkable results. On the subject of the increased prevalence of intemperance at present, as compared with former periods, the writer says,—

'But there is, in the collection of London bills of mortality, an item which enables us to judge, with some degree of correctness, of the alteration which has taken place in the habits of the population of the metropolis. The item to which we allude is that of "deaths by excessive drinking." Examining the London bills of mortality we find, that with one exception, there is no record of death by excessive drinking until the year 1686; nor did the average exceed *one* annually for thirty years after that date. But we find that when, by legislative encouragement to distillation for home use, spirits became the general beverage, deaths by excessive drinking so rapidly increased, that their average, for thirty years, between 1721 and 1750, exceeded *thirty-three* annually, that is, that there were nearly as many deaths from intoxication in *one year* when spirits were used, as there were in the entire *thirty years* between 1686 and 1715, when ale was the chief drink of the citizens.

'The Dublin bills of mortality show, that the effect in that city was the same. In twenty years, between 1726 and 1745, there were but *three* deaths by excessive drinking recorded, ale being, during that time, the principal drink of the laboring classes; but when the encouragement to distillation for home use rendered spirits the more general drink, that is, between the years 1746 and 1757, there died from

intoxication, on an average, *in each year*, more than double the number that had died in the entire of the preceding twenty years.

'Nor is the effect of prohibitions to distillation, in producing sobriety, less remarkable. In the three years prior to the restriction on distillation in England, in 1751, the annual average of deaths by "excessive drinking" in London, was *twenty-one*; in the three years after that partial restriction, the deaths averaged only *twelve*; but in the three years between 1757 and 1760, when distillation was totally prohibited, the annual average of deaths was but *three*.'

Let this be compared with the fact of thirteen deaths in ten days, from excessive drinking, as reported by the coroner, in the district of Sheffield alone, and the contrast is frightful. (Hear, hear.)

To show that in England, up to the latest date, the same effects are produced by the same causes, let me add the following short but convincing testimony from the most authentic source :—

'Mr. Poynder, the sub-sheriff of London, states, that he has been so long in the habit of hearing criminals refer all their misery to the habit of dram drinking, that he has latterly ceased to ask them the causes of their ruin; nearly all the convicts for murder with whom he had conversed had acknowledged that they were under the influence of spirits at the time they committed the acts for which they were about to suffer. Many had assured him, that they found it necessary, before they could commit crimes of particular atrocity, to have recourse to dram drinking as a stimulus to fortify their minds to encounter any risk, and to proceed to all lengths, and he mentions the cases of several atrocious offenders, whose depravity was by themselves attributed to, and was on investigation found, to have originated in such habits of intoxication.'

Sir, I ask the house, as a body of intelligent English gentlemen, as husbands and fathers, as legislators and guardians of the public weal, ought such a state of things as this to continue? I ask whether the picture I have drawn is not literally and painfully true? And I equally ask, whether the time is not fully come, to demand that we should apply a remedy? It will be said, perhaps, by some, though I think there will be few, that the evil is beyond the province of legislation, and can only be met by prospective measures of education, moral training, religious instruction, and other aids of this description. Sir, I am far from undervaluing these powerful and benign agencies in human improvement. But the evil requires present checks, as well as remedies more remote. If the public health is injured; nay, if it is even threatened with only a probable injury, do we not establish quarantines, and interdict commercial intercourse, at immense sacrifices of property, because we will not endanger the life of even one of the king's subjects, by permitting the crew to land, or the cargo to touch the shore, till every ground of apprehension has been removed? If the cholera should appear in any of our towns, notwithstanding every precaution suggested by individual prudence, and self preservation, do we not compel certain regulations of cleanliness and police? Do we not arm medical boards with power to impose quarantine, and to guard the public health, at whatever sacrifice of other objects, if the removal of these be necessary to attain their end? What then is this but legislative interference with the freedom of intercourse and the

freedom of trade? It is as much our duty to maintain the public peace as to save the public health, and, therefore, we have a yeomanry, a militia, a body of watchmen and police. We recognize the propriety of preserving the public morals, by the institution of our courts of law, by the suppression of gambling houses and brothels, the prevention of prize fights, and the apprehension and punishment of pickpockets and thieves; and in doing all this, we but do our duty. If, then, drunkenness be equally injurious to the public health, destructive of the public peace, and dangerous to the public morals of the community—and who will venture to deny that all these effects are produced by it—why should it not be equally subjected to legislative interference and checked by legislative control? Drunkenness is in itself a crime, as much so as adultery, or lying, or theft. As such it is denounced by religion, in terms which no man can misunderstand; and the drunkard is especially declared to be unworthy of inheriting the kingdom of God. But, in addition to its being a crime in itself, it is either the parent and source, or the most powerful auxiliary of almost every other crime that exists. In proof of this assertion, let me adduce the following testimony from the last report of that admirable institution, 'The British and Foreign Temperance Society,' of which the bishop of London is the president, and of which many eminent men of all professions are now become members. That report says,—

'The quantity of spirits which pay duty for home consumption in this kingdom, has more than doubled within a few past years. According to parliamentary returns, made in 1833, it amounted to 25,982,494 gallons at proof, which, with the addition of one-sixth for the reduction of strength by retailers, amounted to 13,429,331*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.*; and this sum does not include any part of the many millions of gallons known to be illicitly distilled, or imported without paying duty.

'Four-fifths of all the crimes in our country have been estimated to be committed under the excitement of liquor. During the year 1833, no less than 29,880 persons were taken into custody by the metropolitan police for drunkenness alone, not including any of the numerous cases in which assaults or more serious offences have been committed, under the influence of drinking; and it should be observed, that this statement relates only to the suburbs of London, without any calculation for the thousands of cases which occurred in the city itself.

'Our parochial expenses, which have been nearly doubled since 1815, are principally occasioned by excessive drinking. Of one hundred and forty-three inmates of a London parish workhouse, one hundred and five have been reduced to that state by intemperance; and the small remainder comprises all the blind, epileptic, and idiotic, as well as all the aged poor, some of whom would also drink to intoxication if opportunity offered.

'More than one half of the madness in our country appears to be occasioned by drinking. Of four hundred and ninety-five patients admitted in four years into a lunatic asylum at Liverpool, two hundred and fifty-seven were known to have lost their reason by this vice.

'The poor's rate and county rate, for England and Wales only, amount to 8,000,000*l.* The proportion of this expenditure, occasioned by drinking, may be most safely estimated at two-thirds, say 5,333,333*l.*,

which, added to the cost of spirits alone, 13,429,331*l.*, gives the sum expended by this nation, in the last five years, on these two objects only, at 93,813,321*l.*; amounting, in only twenty years, to three hundred and seventy-five million pounds sterling; without including any computation for the enormous sums consumed in the *abuse* of wine and beer, the expenses of prosecutions, the injury done to our foreign trade, the loss of shipping, and the notorious destruction of property in various other ways.'

Are these evils of sufficient magnitude to demand legislative interference, or are they not? I hear every one instinctively answer yes! And after the recent admission in this house, that the smaller evils of the beer shop required a legislative remedy, it is impossible that the same assembly can refuse its assent to the proposition that the greater evil of the gin palace requires equal correction and cure. It is not, sir, I am well aware, a very popular topic to quote America as an example in this house; but as the conduct of her legislators in this respect arises in no degree from their republican principles, it may be cited without alarming any political opponent, and will be approved, I think, on all sides, by the moralist and Christian at least. My chief reason for doing so, is, however, to show that a government can do much, even to improve the public morals, by its judicious interference; and that, too, without the slightest violation of rational liberty, or without risking popular dissatisfaction.

Public opinion having been strongly awakened to the evils of intemperance in America, private societies were first formed for preventing, as far as their influence could effect it, the farther spread of this evil; and when they had acquired a strength in the country, by the number and respectability of their members, the legislature voluntarily came forward to second their efforts by their powerful aid. The first step taken by the American government was to issue the following order, which was dated from the war department of the army, on the 2d of November, 1832.

'Hereafter no ardent spirits will be issued to the troops of the United States; but sugar, coffee, and rice shall be substituted instead. No ardent spirits will be allowed to be introduced into any fort, camp, or garrison of the United States, nor sold by any sutler to the troops, nor will any permit be granted for the purchase of ardent spirits.'

About the same period, the secretary of the navy was instructed to select one of the ships of war for the purpose of trying the experiment of abolishing the use of spirits by the seamen; which succeeded so well, and was so soon adopted by the mercantile marine, that at the present moment there are no less than seven hundred American vessels sailing, without a single gallon of ardent spirits on board, and this too, to all parts of the world, amid the icy seas of the arctic and antarctic circles, and in the burning regions of the torrid zone. One of the most striking proofs that could be adduced, perhaps, of the acknowledged value of this abandonment of the use of spirituous drinks at sea, is to be found in the fact, that these American vessels find freights, from a public confidence in their greater safety, when English ones cannot obtain them at all: and but recently, when the eminent house of Baring, Brothers and Company, of London, wrote to their agent in Amsterdam, to know how it was that freights were not obtainable for their vessels,

the reply returned by the agent was, that there were American ships in port, in which the captain, officers, and crew alike abstained from the use of ardent spirits; and that till these were all supplied with freights, no English ship would be engaged. Still more recently, and as a consequence, no doubt, of this communication, the same distinguished merchants have lately launched a noble vessel in the river Thames, destined for the newly-opened trade to China, which is to take no ardent spirits for the use of any one on board, except a small quantity in the medicine chest, as arsenic, or laudanum, or any other poisonous drug to be administered only by the skilful hand of the surgeon; and the public opinion in favor of the wisdom and safety of such a step, is abundantly expressed by the simple fact, that the insurance upon her voyage has been effected at five per cent. premium, instead of six, paid by vessels taking spirits; and, considering the risks incurred by the possible drunkenness of any of the officers, or men at sea, and the risk of fires from the same cause, the difference in the premium is fully justified by the diminished danger of the case. (Hear.)

Let no one imagine, that discontent among the seamen would be the probable result of such an arrangement. The most experienced of our naval commanders know well that drinking is the chief cause of all the disobedience and discontent ever manifested at sea. The excellent Captain Brenton, of his majesty's navy, who takes so deep an interest in the improvement of the service, has again and again declared, that if ardent spirits were withheld, flogging would never be necessary; and the gallant Captain Ross has proved, by the good health and perfect discipline of his intrepid little band, who were buried amidst the polar snows, for many months, without a single drop of ardent spirits, that it is neither necessary to health or contentment: but comparing their own condition with that of other crews, in far less perilous situations, they have good grounds for concluding that ardent spirits are detrimental to both.

Nor is it in the navy only that the absence of ardent spirits leads to improved discipline, and its use produces insubordination; as the testimony of Mr. Marshall, the army physician, whose authority I quoted before, will show. He says,—

'Military discipline, in all its branches, becomes deeply affected by habits of intemperance. To the generally prevailing vice of drinking are to be attributed almost every misdemeanor and crime committed by British soldiers in India. The catalogue of these, unhappily, is not a scanty one; for, by rapid steps, first from petty, and then more serious neglects and inattentions, slovenliness at, and absence from parades, follow disobedience of orders, riots and quarrels in barracks, absence from guards and other duties, affrays with the natives, theft, and selling of their own and their comrades' necessaries, robberies, abusive language, and violence to non-commissioned officers, insolence to officers; and last of all, desertion, mutiny, and murder may be traced to this source. This frightful picture is not exaggerated. I have seen thirty-two punished men in a regimental hospital at one time. Perhaps not a single individual of that number suffered for a crime which was not a direct or indirect consequence of the immoderate use of spirits. I recollect attending at the punishment of seven men of the same regiment, who received among them four thousand two hundred

lashes. They had all been tried for crimes arising from habits of intemperance.'

The duke of Wellington, in the regimental orders issued to the grenadier guards in October of the last year, 1833, dwells at large on the fact of increased crime in the army resulting from increased drunkenness; and attributes all the breaches of discipline and other offences principally to this cause: a fact also which has been tacitly admitted by the secretary at war, who recently expressed his apprehension at the abolishment of military flogging, because insubordination and crime had latterly increased in the British army. The cause of that increase was clearly seen by the duke of Wellington, as arising from increased drunkenness; and the increased drunkenness arose from those increased facilities created by the gin shops, staring the passenger in the face at every step of his way through almost every part of the great thoroughfares of this metropolis. The example followed by the American government, of withholding all supplies of spirit rations to the troops, would have at once effected the cure.

Passing from the American army, navy, and mercantile marine, we find that the legislature has not been indifferent to the subject, in the interior towns. In the state of Vermont an animated debate occurred on the question, whether the corporations of the towns in that state should have the power to grant any licenses at all for the sale of ardent spirits: and the result of the discussion was, a withholding of that right, on the ground that ardent spirits were a deadly poison; a sentiment already quoted from Sir Astley Cooper, who, for that reason, would never permit any to be kept in his house; and that therefore the state ought not to sanction, by their license, any traffic in it at all, except as other poisons, under the care of a discreet and prudent dealer in medicines. The state of Ohio soon after imitated this example. In the state of New-York the towns have been empowered, by an annual meeting of their inhabitants, to determine by a majority of householders' votes, whether any, and how many retailers of spirituous liquors, shall be licensed in their respective communities. In the whole county of Plymouth, in the state of Massachusetts, where there are 40,000 inhabitants, not a single person is now licensed to sell spirits. In the month of February, 1833, a society was formed, composed entirely of members of the national congress, and officers of the public service, civil, naval, and military, for the progressive abolition of the use and sale of ardent spirits; so as to give to this object all the weight of the highest government influence. Their first meeting was held in the senate chamber—the Hon. William Watkins, one of the members of the senate, being called to the chair, and the Hon. Walter Lowrie, the secretary to the senate, acting as secretary to the society thus formed. The house of representatives entered as cordially into this association as the house of assembly, and the local legislatures of the several states have almost wholly followed their example. The result of all this united power of public opinion, and government authority and example, cordially operating together, has been this: that in America, within the last few years only, more than two thousand persons have voluntarily abandoned the distillation of ardent spirits, and invested their capital in more wholesome and useful pursuits; and upward of six thousand persons

have abandoned the sale of ardent spirits, and converted their houses and their stock in trade to better purposes.

Sir, these are facts, which speak so loudly that they need no commentator to expound their meaning. They show what the force of public opinion has effected, in America, in enlisting the legislature to engage in the work of moral and social reform; and they prove how extensively that reform may be safely and usefully carried, when a people and their rulers cordially co-operate together for the accomplishment of one common end. I ask myself, then, has public opinion yet expressed itself in England with sufficient power and sufficient intelligence to deserve legislative aid? Let the answer be seen in the following extract from an official report:—

'The first European temperance society was established in 1829, by the exertions of Mr. G. W. Carr, at New Ross, in the south of Ireland; and others were early formed in the north of that island, and in Scotland. Their principles have been spread with much zeal and perseverance, and with most cheering success, among the manufacturing population of the north of England; Lancashire and Yorkshire alone, where the earliest efforts were made, containing above 30,000 members. Above four hundred temperance societies and associations have been formed in England, including the interesting islands of Guernsey, Jersey, and Man; the whole comprising, according to the latest returns, more than 80,000 members. Scotland, under the direction of the vigorous committee of the Scottish Society, numbers about 400 societies, and 54,000 members. In Ireland, notwithstanding numerous disadvantages and difficulties, about 20,000 persons have joined the standard of temperance societies.'

At the head of the great Metropolitan Society stands the name of the bishop of London; followed by nine other prelates of the established Church, and eight members of the house of peers. Among the vice presidents of the society are six members of the house of commons, ten admirals, four generals, three physicians, and many more of the clerical, legal, and other liberal professions. At their last anniversary, held only a few days ago, the bishop of Winchester in the chair, not less than 4,000 persons were present, who manifested the most intense interest in the proceedings. Already have a great number of petitions been laid upon the table of the house during the present session only, signed by persons of the highest respectability, praying the house to institute at least an inquiry into the subject; so that by collecting and arranging the evidence on this notoriously-prevalent evil, a committee might be enabled to suggest for mature consideration, and, if approved, for ultimate adoption, such legislative measures as might to them seem best calculated to arrest its future progress, and, if possible, lessen its present amount.

Sir, it is for such a committee that I now ask; in order that the legislature, by giving its sanction to the inquiry which is proposed as its first step, may strengthen that public opinion which, though already loudly expressed on this subject, will be more than doubled in its force by the approbation of the senatorial voice. In that committee the various suggestions that may arise can be calmly and patiently discussed. The house acceded to the motion of the noble marquis, the member for Buckinghamshire, (Lord Chandos,) during the last session,

for an inquiry into the operations of the beer bill, with a view to ascertain whether any and what measures could be devised for the better regulation of the beer houses in the rural districts; and upon the evidence so obtained, the honorable member for Kent (Sir Edward Knatchbull) has framed, and passed through a second reading, supported by an immense majority, a bill for farther restricting their privileges, and lessening the amount of the evils they have produced. Will the house then say, that though the sale and consumption of beer among the thinly-scattered population of the agricultural districts is a fit and proper subject for legislative inquiry and legislative restraint, yet the sale and consumption of ardent spirits in the thickly-peopled towns is too harmless to be disturbed? This would indeed be 'straining at the gnat and swallowing the camel.' But of such an absurdity as this I will not believe the house to be capable. (Hear, hear.)

The objection that is urged against any legislative interference in such a matter as this I have already partly anticipated and answered, when I have shown that we interfere, and properly so, to prevent, by legislative measures, the spread of disease, and poverty, and crime; and if we believe drunkenness to be injurious to society as a powerful instrument in producing all these, we are perfectly justified in interfering to stay the progress of its devastating influence. The author of the inquiry, whom I quoted before, has a passage, however, so appropriate to this subject, that I quote it as strengthening greatly the argument in my favor. He says,—

'We are aware that there are many who may object to this species of monopoly as a restriction on the freedom of trade; some who consider that the occupation of a publican should be as unfettered as that of a shoemaker or a tailor, and that the man who has a desire for drink, and the money to pay for it, should have every opportunity of getting drunk, if he has the misfortune to wish it. But let it be recollected, that the very first law of society is, that individuals shall not be permitted to do that, which, although considered beneficial to themselves, may be injurious to the community at large. The statute book is full of restrictions founded on this principle. No man can continue to work a factory if it be injurious to the health of those around him. A butcher is not permitted to expose for sale unsound meat. A baker is not permitted to sell unwholesome bread, because it is held criminal to place within the reach of any man that, the use of which is injurious to him. No man is permitted to keep a public gaming house, because it is considered criminal even to tempt a man to risk his property, or to provide him with the means of squandering the substance of his family. Nor is any one permitted to have indelicate exhibitions, or to use other temptations to vice. Why then should the sale of ardent spirits be unrestricted, when their baleful influence on health and morals is acknowledged? And should it be considered less criminal to tempt a mechanic or a laborer to squander his wages, and to destroy his morals and his health, by the excessive use of spirits, than to do it by any other means?'

As it may be expected of me, however, that I should state more specifically some of the few remedies that I should venture to suggest to the committee when granted, though their adoption would of course depend on their subsequent approval by them for their report, and by

the house itself before any enactment could give them the force of law, I will venture to enumerate the principal ones.

First, I should recommend the payment of all wages to be made before ten o'clock in the morning of Saturday, instead of any later period of that day, or even on Friday evening, because the transition from the pay table to the regular labor of the day, instead of to the entertainment of the evening, would in itself be a powerful lessening of the temptation to drink.

Secondly, That workmen should never be paid at any public house, or place where intoxicating drinks of any kind were sold, whether by their employer or any other person.

Third, To permit no new spirit shops to be established, or old ones to have their licenses renewed, but by the requisition of a considerable number of householders residing within the immediate vicinity of the shop itself, and even then only on large securities for the good conduct of its keeper.

Fourth, To close all those that do exist the entire day on Sunday, and at an earlier hour than at present on other days; and otherwise so to regulate them as to combine the two objects of giving great openness and publicity to all their proceedings, and of preventing any protracted stay of the visitors on the premises.

Fifth, To make it imperative on the police, or other officers exercising the duty of guardians or watchmen during the day or night, to apprehend and take to some appointed station for that purpose, all persons found, either in the spirit shops or in the streets, in a state of intoxication, there to be confined, for a limited period, nor to be released until restored to sobriety.

The tendency of all these restrictions would be to lessen the number of spirit shops, and consequently the number of spirit drinkers; and these I should consider the most effective of the immediate checks. If there be any who think that lessening the number and the force of the temptations to crime of any kind, will not lessen the amount of crime committed, it would be in vain to hope for their acquiescence in my views; though, to be consistent with themselves, they should remove all the restraints of law and police on robbers, murderers, and incendiaries. It has been well said, that there are effects which in their turn become causes, and this is the case with the increased number of spirit shops: they are, perhaps, at first the effects of an increased desire for intoxicating drinks. But they soon become causes of increasing the propensity they seek to gratify. Rival establishments endeavor to outvie each other in the number and strength of their allurements; and thousands are every day seduced into the vortex of drunkenness, who, but for these allurements and temptations, would never have fallen victims to its destructive power; so that every new license granted by a government to a retailer of ardent spirits, is in reality a commission given to that individual, by the supreme authority of the state, to use every art and every stratagem to tempt others of his fellow men to their ruin!

And let it not for a moment be supposed that the lessening the number of the spirit shops, or the abatement of the consumption of ardent spirits, would be an invasion of the poor man's rights or comforts, or would abridge his pleasures or lessen his enjoyments. Not

to cite the evidence with which American official documents abound as to the large increase of happiness to the people who had been reclaimed from spirit drinking, by the diminution of spirit shops, the cessation of distilleries, and the suspension of the vast machinery of poverty, disease, and crime, I content myself with citing a single passage from the well-known work of Mr. Colquhoun, in his Treatise on the Police of London, the last authority I shall quote. That careful and accurate observer of the condition of the people in this metropolis says, at p. 328 of his able work,—

'It is a curious and important fact, that during the period when the distilleries were stopped, in 1796 and 1797, although bread and every necessary of life was considerably higher than during the preceding year, the poor, in that quarter of the town where the chief part reside, were apparently more comfortable, paid their rents more regularly, and were better fed than at any period for some years before, even although they had not the benefit of the extensive charities which were distributed in 1795. This can only be accounted for by their being denied the indulgence of gin, which had become, in a great measure, inaccessible from its very high price. It may fairly be concluded, that the money formerly spent in this imprudent manner had been applied in the purchase of provisions and other necessaries, to the amount of some hundred thousand pounds. The effects of their being deprived of this baneful liquor was also evident in their *more orderly conduct, quarrels and assaults were less frequent*, and they resorted seldomer to the pawnbrokers' shops; and yet, during the chief part of this period, bread was fifteen pence the quartern loaf, meat higher than the preceding year, particularly pork, which arose in part from the stoppage of the distilleries, but chiefly from the scarcity of grain.'

The chancellor of the exchequer may perhaps feel some apprehension for the revenue at present derived from so prolific a source as the consumption of ardent spirits, and he may fear to arrest the torrent of drunkenness that desolates the land, lest pecuniary defalcation to the treasury should result. But, let me calm the anxieties of the noble lord on that score. I shall neither propose to increase the duty suddenly and greatly, and so encourage smuggling; nor lessen it in the slightest degree, and so encourage consumption; though I should be disposed to recommend a reduction of the duties on malt, on light French wines, on tea, coffee, and other equally wholesome beverages, to substitute for the pernicious poison of spirits in every shape, the imposts on which might be gradually heightened as the duties on the former were progressively decreased. My object would be, first, to prevent any farther increase to the number of houses now devoted to this guilty and destructive traffic; next, gradually to reduce the number as well as the strength of the auxiliary temptations with which they now abound; and, lastly, to put those that may remain under such wholesome regulations as shall at least abate, if not wholly extirpate, the disease and crime of which they are the present dens. In addition to such present remedies as may be added to meet the present evil, I shall be prepared to show that we might greatly prevent its farther spread, by establishing adult as well as infant schools, aided by humble museums, and collections of works of nature and of art; so exciting to rational curiosity, and so powerful in refining the tastes and feelings

of the least informed; as well as by instituting instructive and entertaining lectures on popular branches of knowledge, and encouraging the establishment of parish libraries and district reading rooms, provided with cheaper and more innocent refreshments than the liquid poison now consumed, so as to afford to the laboring population that opportunity of social meeting, and cheap exhilaration, which their daily toils entitle as well as prepare them to enjoy; and affording them opportunities for the development of their mental faculties and moral feelings, by that collision of opinion and interchange of sentiment, which, under sober exercise, is a fruitful source of attachment and esteem, but which, under the influence of intoxication, degenerates into bitterness and strife.

All this, sir, I feel assured, if the committee for which I ask be granted, we may do, even for the present generation, who deserve our earliest and most immediate care. And when we have stayed the inundating flood, and prevented it from engulfing in its devouring waves the strength and virtue of our land, then may we turn to that rising generation whose tender years call loudly for our paternal care, and providing for them a system of national and universal instruction, teach them that it is their interest to be sober, industrious, and well informed, leaving them, prepared with the elements of knowledge at least, to work out this problem for themselves, and to enjoy its demonstration in their own improved condition and augmented happiness, produced by the national tuition wisely and well applied. From such a state of renovated health in the now diseased portion of society, what wealth might we not anticipate? The exchequer, instead of being fed on the one hand, as it now is, by a revenue of four or five millions, from the consumption of intoxicating drinks, and drained on the other of fifteen or twenty millions for our poor rates, and hospitals, and jails, and hulks, and armies, and police, would be receiving, from the consumption of more wholesome and nutritious articles, and from the profits of productive industry, now utterly lost and cast away, a revenue of fifteen or twenty millions on the one hand, and on the other be drained of four or five millions only, for the maintenance of an army of schoolmasters, an ordnance department of books and materials of instruction, a war office, to assist the conquests of knowledge over ignorance, dock yards and arsenals, to construct and equip ships for conveying the healthy, and industrious, and enterprising of our unoccupied population to lands, where their superior intelligence and habitual sobriety would make their well-directed labors a source of wealth to themselves, and of blessings to others. These, sir, are but a portion of the advantages which anticipation shadows forth in the future, if we have but the courage and the virtue to reclaim our unhappy countrymen from the two debasing influences which now weigh them down—ignorance and demoralization.' And if we believe that that Supreme Being, whose blessing we invoke on every occasion of our assembling in this house, to pursue the solemn duty of legislative improvement, does really hear our prayers, and regard our actions with pleasure or disapprobation, let us be assured that the most acceptable, because the most effective manner, in which we can evince our gratitude to Him, for the blessings of health, instruction, and happiness which we enjoy, is to extend those blessings to the greatest number of our fellow beings,

and spread the sunshine of comfort, in which we ourselves are permitted to bask, over those who are now buried in the chilly gloom and deadly darkness of ignorance and intemperance combined.

Believing, therefore, that parliamentary investigation and legislative measures founded thereon may greatly accelerate the accomplishment of this desirable end, I beg leave, sir, to move, in the words of the original resolution,—

'That a select committee be appointed, to inquire into the extent, causes, and consequences of the prevailing vice of intoxication among the laboring classes of the United Kingdom, in order to ascertain whether any legislative measures can be devised to prevent the farther spread of so great a national evil.'

The motion was opposed by Lord Althorp, on the part of the government, and several others; but on a division it was carried by sixty-four against forty-seven, the majority being received with loud cheers; and a committee of forty persons was appointed.

ON THE BEING AND SOVEREIGNTY OF GOD.

A DISCOURSE, BY THE REV. JAMES NICOLS,
Of the Methodist E. Church, at Somerville, New-Jersey.

'Alleluia! for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,' Revelation xix, 6.

THE wise and inspired King Solomon, in the days of Jewish monarchy, said, 'There is no new thing under the sun.' His illustrious sire also remarked, 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.' In the advocates of atheism therefore, in modern times, we are not to look for the teachers of a new system. They are only the unphilosophical disciples of those opponents to true wisdom, who flourished cotemporaneously with David and his princely son. They inculcate the same lessons as their predecessors, who have lived between that period and the present.

There is one thing, however, which distinguishes atheists of this age from those of former times. Formerly they concealed their creed from the public eye, while their lives evinced their unbelief in the being of God; for, 'The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God.' Now, they are not only careless of publicity, but they seek it. And while their lives make the same manifestation as did those of their forerunners, we are openly challenged to produce our testimony that 'the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.' Solely resting, my brethren, upon His almighty and gracious arm, whose existence His bewildered creatures presume to doubt, we shall endeavor to show,

I. That there exists a benevolent, omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient God, such as Christians worship.

II. His sovereign relation to His intelligent creatures.

III. Their duty to Him, as suggested by the text.

I. 1. It is not because we have any doubts as to the correctness of this position; or that we believe any of those whose sentiments harmonize with ours entertain the least cavil; or that the pretensions of

Christianity have not already been ably defended against the oppositions of the various classes of infidels, that we attempt this subject. Dr. Paley, in his essays, by a most apt analogy, has left no reasonable ground for any contrary argument. And in the luminous bodies of evidence, which have been adduced to set forth the truth of the Christian religion—the opposite theory to atheism—very satisfactory conclusions may be seen.

2. Notwithstanding all these correct inferences and deductions, the poison in many instances has been found too strong for the remedy. Yea, the disease has grown worse, and assumed a more morbid hue. Even the weapons which the deist has frequently wielded against revealed religion, have been wrested from his grasp by that class of infidels who, with a commendable consistency, have put on the garb of atheists, and have been turned against himself. Ridicule and satire are the instruments with which the miners and sappers of infidelity propose to blow up the walls of Zion, and thus for ever to prevent the watchmen from sounding the alarm of danger. Had not an able divine of our own age already rendered it unnecessary, it would perhaps be as efficient a means as any of parrying their feeble blows, to turn their satire and ridicule upon themselves.

It is stoutly contended by not a few of those modern heroes, who have entered the lists against the superstitious votaries of Christianity, that this universe came into being by chance. Let us grant them what is very essential to the position, but which in the argument they have no right to demand, the previous existence of a chaos. There was once a time when the constituent elements of the universe were floating in the wildest chaotic confusion. Although possessed of every thing necessary for composing the beautiful and harmonious system of nature, then nothing but the most unsightly irregularity prevailed. After a lapse of ages, the same even and uninterrupted thread having been spinning all the while, on a sudden, and without the least visible, or indeed any cause at all, a tremendous explosion takes place—the vivid glare of a thousand clouds, surcharged with electric fluid, is seen to pervade and to skirt round about the millions of aquatic, fiery, aerial, and earthly atoms, which are sailing without any attractive or repulsive principle upon the stormy ocean of immensity of space. And hark! order takes the place of confusion. The elements collect, and are blended together so harmoniously that the most critical eye cannot detect the traces of their primary disorder. The majestic ocean floats around the earth, through the apertures of which the ocean's tributaries wind and flow. The smooth river gently glides along its channel, reflecting from its glassy surface the groves and copses of evergreen that decorate its banks. The tiny stream, which issues from the rock in the side of the mountain, gurgles down the declivity as it seeks the plain, bordered by soft and velvet margins of moss. The cloud-capt hill rears its lofty summit to the skies, offering to the astonished beholder a conspicuous idea of the sublime and the terrible: while the dismal volcano belches from its crater the liquid sulphureous lava.

In the meantime, as if this work of chance had been incomplete, man, intelligent and rational man, composed of a thousand different nerves, and muscles, and veins, and arteries, and bones, and joints, and sinews, all placed in the most suitable and best-adapted positions,

arises above the mighty void, and assumes the reins of government over all inferior animals. The planetary system also *happens*. The sun, 'that glorious orb, whose beams create our day,' *happens* to take the centre. The others *happen* to assume their several orbits, and commence the unceasing work of revolving in their several annual and diurnal motions. How wonderful *an accident* was this, which arranged with so elegant and so varied a symmetry the vast universe!

3. But this is a consideration of too much gravity to be thus lightly disposed of. Indeed, in these days of infidel boldness and confidence, a problem is proposed, which demands no little of our notice. 'We are charged,' says a celebrated heroine of atheism, 'with being credulous, for believing that the universe has existed from eternity; but you (Christians) go a step farther than we, in contending for the eternal existence of a Spirit, who, you say, created the universe.'

We have now before us one of the atheistic creeds, viz. *the eternal existence of the universe.* This we shall first discuss. Then it will be our duty to discuss the other, and the only other to which atheists have resorted, or, indeed, can resort; that is, *the universe came into being by chance.*

You perceive, my brethren, that in this controversy we have laid aside the armor of defence. We shall not ask you to follow us through a tedious process of reasoning, such as our pious fathers used in contending earnestly for the faith, by calling up the witnesses of antiquity to depose to the truth of those miracles which substantiate the Divine authenticity of the doctrines of revealed religion. This has been done often enough. And the great reason why those proofs have been unavailing to convince the skeptic, is, not that the evidence possesses too little strength, but that the skeptic has given it too little attention. And this possibly may be the fate of our offensive argument. Be that, however, as it may, we think that the propositions which have been attempted as substitutes for our belief in the creation of the universe, when analyzed, will be discovered to be untenable.

4. The question now is, Has the universe existed eternally? The absurdity of this position can be speedily demonstrated. It will not be denied that in its present aspect and condition the world has not been for ever. It is continually undergoing various and multiplied changes. Every day some of our race are born, and some expire. So that the exact question to be resolved is, whether in this mutable and changing condition it has for ever existed.

It will not be necessary to direct our attention to every item of which the world is made up;—the reasoning which may be used in the case of one item, or of one part, if conclusive, may be fairly applied to every other part; and the general issue may thus be impartially determined: that is to say, instead of selecting the human race first, and then the race of inferior animals second, and so through the several species of which the animal, and vegetable, and mineral kingdoms are composed, as the successive topics of a discussion, let the conclusion (whatever it be) of the argument upon the eternal existence of one, be considered as satisfactory for the whole.

Let us take the human race, for instance, as the subject of this investigation.

The world is thronged with a dense and numerous population. It is a fact, in the nature of things, that as we go down the tide of successive generations the number of people increases. Leaving out of view subsequent emigrants, we know that the original settlers of America are greatly exceeded in number by their posterity of the present day. Now the same fact teaches, that if we ascend the tide of past generations the number of people continually diminishes. Let us follow on this tide, the number of our race perpetually growing less, and we shall at length find the source of the stream, or, in other words, we shall inevitably arrive at the number of two: that is, it is obvious from two ancestors, a male and a female, the whole population of the globe have derived their being. Having reduced the population to their original progenitors, the inquiry meets us, Did those two live from eternity? It is allowed that they are now dead: that is, their lives have come to an end. End implies duration: thus, we mean by the end of a week, or a month, the termination of the duration of those periods. Duration implies divisibility: thus, a week, or month, or year, may be divided into halves, quarters, and eighths, &c. Therefore the life of the two first human beings, having duration, is divisible; and it may consequently be divided. It is not material to the argument that we be able to ascertain what is the half of that life. Suppose it to be twelve millions of years. Double the half and you have the whole number: then it would be twenty-four millions. Whatever be the half, by going back the same number of years farther, we reach the beginning of their life; and the conclusion is mathematically certain, that they did not live from eternity.

5. We shall now inquire, Has the universe existed by chance? Driven from the absurd position of an eternal world, atheists betake themselves to the hypothesis that all things came into existence fortuitously. This hypothesis appears equally as untenable as the other. And we again remark, that were the claims of the Christian religion soberly examined, it would not be so lightly rejected, nor its appropriate residence of authority in the human mind be occupied by the crude and unwarrantable chimeras of atheism.

What is chance? *Accident*, is the plain answer; that is, the fortuitous falling out of circumstances. Now, in order for any accident to happen, it is necessary that something have existed before it. For instance, we are told, 'A dreadful accident lately occurred,—a man was carelessly riding along the brink of a precipice, his horse stumbled, and he fell over and was killed.' In this case, before the accident could have happened, there must have been the precipice, the man, the horse; all these things existing previously. So with every or any accident: there must have been something existing before it. Let us now apply this reasoning to the wonderful accident by which this broad and expansive world came into being! What existed before this accident happened? You reply, 'Its elements, to be sure.' Well; whether those elements be four, according to the old notion of the chemist, or whether they be many more, according to the later opinions of the chemist, it matters not. We wish to know what existed before the elementary ingredients, or constituent parts of the world? If you reply that nothing existed before, then you give up the position that the world came into being by chance—since no chance

or accident could take place without the prior existence of something. And if you reply that something existed previously, you run either into the already exploded hypothesis of the eternal existence of the universe, or to the very position to which it is our purpose, in this discussion, to lead you; viz. 'That the universe exists, because it was created by a self-existent, invisible, and independent Spirit, whom we call God.' And in this case the conclusion is as mathematically certain, as in the other, that the universe did not derive its being from chance.

6. With this view of the subject, the result of the argument is easy. Only three creeds, by which the existence of the world is attempted to be accounted for, are presented for the adoption of mankind. Two of these are the atheistical hypotheses: these have just been discussed. The third is the creed of Christianity, which refers the existence of the universe to the creative power of an 'immortal, eternal, and invisible' Being.

Now, if it be true that the existence of the universe must be accounted for in one of these three modes; and that we have succeeded in making out the nullity of the first two, then it is equally true, and incapable of controversy, that the doctrine of Christianity on this subject must be correct. For illustration: three bills are presented at a bank to be exchanged for specie; by some means, before they are offered it was known that one of them must be genuine, and that but one of them could be. Two are first examined, and found to be counterfeit: in this case, there could be no hesitancy in receiving the third. Again: a new machine has lately been invented. Three persons apply at the office, each claiming the invention, and each demanding a patent right. One of them satisfies the officer of the impossibility of the claims of the other two being correct. Now suppose this one should be unable, after such undoubted evidence against his competitors, to explain to the officer, whose mind has been unschooled in the mysteries of mechanism, the process by which he arrived at the invention, yet he could not be debarred, one moment, from the patent right. In like manner, though the Almighty, around whose throne are clouds and darkness, should never have made plain to our limited intellects the wondrous mode, by which, in the creation of the world, He spoke, and it was done, He commanded, and it stood fast; yet when it is demonstrated that the world could have existed in no other way, than as the creature of the unoriginated 'I AM,' upon the same ground of unquestionable reason and equity are we bound to award its existence to his creating hand.

7. The third position, having, by the 'reductio ad absurdum' of its rival positions, been demonstrated to be a tenable one, the inquiry now is, 'How came this doctrine of the creation of the world to be suggested to Christians?'

The only answer, which, as we think, can be given to this question, is, that the doctrine of the creation was communicated by the Creator Himself to His first rational subjects, and, subsequently either re-communicated, or handed down, through the successive generations of our race, to the children of men. We will venture a few reflections upon the structure of the human mind, in order to show that man, by his own wisdom, or by the skill of his own intuitive perceptions, and

adroit deductions, without the aid of a revealed communication from the Creator, could never have arrived at the idea of this doctrine. The human mind is possessed of intellect; that is, capacity for receiving instruction, and of understanding it to be true or false, when received. This faculty of receiving instruction would consequently remain vacant, unless there were both some teacher and something to be taught. A vessel, for illustration, has a cavity or space to contain; this, however, would remain an empty space, unless something were put into it, to occupy the cavity. Now, although since it has pleased God to give to our intellectual faculty the information that he created the universe, we are capable of assenting to the doctrine, that it is true, yet had there been no such revelation, we cannot perceive how the doctrine could have found its way into the human mind. Now suppose God, upon the creation of man, had either not been visibly present, or had instantly withdrawn His visible presence, before any communication had been made to His creature, how would man, by any wisdom of his own, have known any thing of the origin of his existence? It is very true that he could have reasoned upon the soundness or unsoundness of any hypothesis, which might have been offered by another creature; and, as we have already done, have demonstrated the nullity of an atheistic creed; could have shown the impossibility of either the eternal, or the casual existence of all things; yet then he must have stopped his conclusions, and without the positive teaching of a direct revelation from God, the Maker, must have groped in the darkness of everlasting conjecture, and remained an endless mystery to himself.

8. Now you easily percieve, my brethren, that we are not about to tarry long, in controversy with the deist, as he is called, who, discarding the evidence of revelation, tells us, that by his own ingenuity, unaided and uninspired, he adopts for his creed, the existence of God. If his positions be true, then we must acknowledge that we discredit those conclusions, to which we have already arrived: that we believe what we have already demonstrated to be false.

Again: if deism be true, we must either believe that a revelation was never made, or that the Spirit of unbounded wisdom who made it, so far departed from His wise counsels as to perform an act wholly unnecessary. For surely if 'the world by wisdom knew God,' then a revelation of the same truths would be instructing those who needed no instruction; and would resemble the pedantry of a conceited tutor, who, in order to display his mathematical lore, should attempt to teach a pupil, already grounded and skilled in the science, the elements of Euclid.

Again: it behoves the deist, in opposing the absurdities of the atheist, to tell us at what period of the world the doctrine of the creation was originated. Whether that doctrine was taught by any of the advocates of deism, at an earlier period than it was taught in the Bible? Whether any deistical author, antecedent to Moses, gave forth that the world was created by God, or whether Moses was in advance of them all, and told to the universe at large, that 'in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth.' This is the true way to state the question. Now, as the Bible assumes to give the earlier information on this point, and the point is conceded by the deist, it becomes

him to show that the Bible's account is not earlier, but that it is later than his own.

And unless he can show that the information, claiming to be revealed, is later than his own account of the matter, then we conclude that the Bible history is of greater antiquity than the authority of deism. And it follows, that the account of the creation is not the product of deistical invention, and consequently that it must have been revealed.*

Thus we discard the idea of natural theology altogether. We mean by theology, what the term imports, a word, or a communication from God Himself. It is therefore necessary that there should have been a communication from Him, in order for us to have any correct information about Him. Or, if you please to say, that theology means a dissertation concerning Divine things, we shall please to ask you whence you derived your knowledge of those things, and shall hold on with unswerving tenacity to revelation, as the only source of this knowledge, until you point us to a source higher and of greater antiquity.

Once more: the deist will allow that a teacher cannot give more instruction than he has already in possession himself. It follows, that to suppose the visible and material things around us could instruct us in the history of the creation, would be to suppose either, that they possessed faculties capable of receiving instruction, which they do not, or, which is equally absurd, that they can teach more than they know themselves. And if it be said that numbers, by being put with numbers, give other numbers as the product, to this we do not object; for still nothing of a higher nature than numbers is arrived at. So that the argument still stands secure, that the teacher can impart no more information than he himself is in possession of.

There is but a single process of reasoning by which the deist can at all escape the force of the preceding arguments, and that process we shall demonstrate to be itself unsound. The reasoning to which we allude is as follows: 'There is nothing without a cause,'—'but, there are many things in existence; therefore some cause must have produced them.' Hence it is concluded, that without revelation, the existence of a Divine Being could be inferred. The fallacy of this argument lies in the major proposition; that is, in the position, 'There is nothing without a cause.' For this position is at war with the very conclusion at which the deist aims, namely, the existence of God. For if it be true that there is nothing without a cause—then it is true there is no God. We find then the incompetency of the human intellect, apart from revelation, to know the doctrine of the creation. There is therefore no middle ground between downright atheism on the one hand, and a cordial embrace of the revelation from God on the other.

9. But one more question remains to be determined, before our first position it established; 'that there exists such a God as Christians worship.' The Alcoran, containing the writings of Mohammed, claims to have been revealed from God. This claim, it will be seen, does not impeach the Divine authenticity of the Christian's Bible.

* The author of the discourse considers the apostle's meaning in Romans i, 20, to be, that the apparent, or the visible things of the world, are a confirmation of the truths of revelation: in other words, that they substantiate, when reasoned and reflected on, that doctrine of the creation, which in his opinion can only be derived from a revelation of God.

For Mohammed acknowledged his belief in the excellence of the character of Moses. It follows, that if the prophet of the musselmans be not an impostor, his declaration in favor of Moses only establishes the truth of the Mosaic history of the creation. If he be an impostor, then none of his sayings can impeach the truth of the Bible. Whatever, therefore, the Bible teaches concerning Divine subjects, upon the most undoubted principles of *reason*, we are bound to receive as true.

10. The necessity, in order to account for the existence of the universe, for the existence of a self-existent, independent, and spiritual Being, having been demonstrated, and the canonical writings of the Old and New Testaments attested to be the true and genuine revelation from God, by irrefutable evidence of a positive kind, beside the negative testimony which we, in this discourse, have advanced; in them we are to look for the only information to be found respecting the being and character of God. 1. That He is benevolent in His nature, St. John testifies: 'God is love.' 2. That He is omnipotent is asserted both in our text and by Jesus Christ: 'with God all things are possible,' Matt. xix, 26. 3. His omnipresence is deducible from many passages. Isaiah addresses Him as the 'high and lofty One, who inhabiteth eternity.' He who is said not to be contained by the heaven of heavens, is also represented by David as pervading the bottomless pit: 'If I make my bed in hell, lo, thou art there.' 4. St. Peter asserts the omniscience of God in speaking to our Lord: 'Thou knowest all things.' And farther it is said; 'Known unto the Lord are all His works from the foundation of the world.' 5. By consulting the pages of revelation, we are furnished with the solution of a difficulty which might possibly be started, respecting the immortality of the soul, if our argument against the eternal existence of the world be true. We argued that termination implied divisibility, and consequently commencement. Now, if it be said, that beginning, for the same reason, implies end, we have only to say, that we see nothing in the essence or nature of the human soul that would perpetuate itself to all eternity, were it not the will of God thus to perpetuate it. 'In Him we live, and move, and have our being.' He made us, and He only can uphold and preserve us. The same Omnipotence that spoke us into being, out of nothing, could, were He pleased to do so, speak us out of being, into nothing.

II. Having proved the existence of God, it is our purpose, in the second place, to consider the relation He sustains to His intelligent creatures. Our text shows us, that this is a relation of *sovereignty*. 'The Lord God omnipotent reigneth.' Our ideas of government arrange it in three divisions, or departments. 1. The legislative. 2. The judicial. 3. The executive department. In this order we shall examine the character of the Divine government.

1. Jehovah has given laws to the creatures of His hand.

The excellence of a lawgiver is determined by the skill with which he adapts his enactments to the people whom he governs. It has been supposed by some that the people of France, at the time of the French revolution, were not suited to the genius of a republican government. The English nation is also presumed by many to be best qualified for a limited monarchy. Hence the wisdom of Napoleon, on the one

hand, and of British statesmen on the other, has been acknowledged, inasmuch as they accommodated their respective laws to the constitution of their respective nations. But, notwithstanding, the subjects of their legislation were only fragments of the human race; with all their knowledge of political economy, their laws were not free from defects. Nor have the codes of the most skilful legislators ever claimed complete exemption from error. Not so, however, with the Divine laws: they are perfect; in every respect adapted to the multifarious 'tribes, and tongues, and people, and kindred,' that occupy our extended globe.

When God is contemplated as the Creator of mankind, we can have no difficulty in conceiving of His ability to make His own laws correspond with the genius of His own creatures. And His benevolence would prevent Him from framing any enactments contrary to the dictates of His wisdom.

Another point of excellence in the Divine code, is its simplicity and universal publicity. Human laws are often couched in ambiguous terms and phrases: the Divine are plain and easy to be understood; so that 'the wayfaring man, though (comparatively) a fool, need not err therein.' With men it is a maxim, that ignorance of the law is no apology for its transgression. Yet it would not be difficult to suppose a case, in which, equitably speaking, this would be a proper plea for justification. Suppose a national legislature should decree, 'that any foreigner, coming into the country after the passage of this act, who shall not pay into the treasury the sum of fifty pounds immediately upon his arrival, shall be imprisoned for one year.' An unfortunate man, on his passage on the high seas at the time, just arrives in season to suffer the penalty. It was utterly impossible for him, by any power or wisdom of his own, to have avoided the actual guilt: yet his ignorance is no extenuation, and he suffers the sentence of the law. The laws of God are free from all such injustice: there can be but two situations in regard to them, in which it is possible for men to be placed. They either have the written oracles, or they have not. If they have them, they cannot plead ignorance. If they have them not, then they are not judged by them; but 'they are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing, or else excusing one another,' Rom. ii, 15. In other language, by the infinitude of His wisdom and His power, God either puts into the hands of men His written will, else through the more obscure medium of oral tradition He inscribes it in intelligible characters upon their minds, so that they who are disposed to do it, cannot fail to comprehend the will of God concerning them.

The two great prominent features of the Divine law are, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and thy neighbor as thyself.' From this fountain emanate all its parts as tributary streams. Upon these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets! And every apology on the score of inability is met and remedied by the all-sufficient efficacy of the atonement of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

2. We are now to consider Jehovah in His judicial character. The virtue of the bench consists in its impartial administration of justice. God is then perfect, in His judicial capacity, inasmuch as He is free

from any possibility of injustice. Only two things ever stood in the way of an entire and faithful discharge of the duties of this office—ignorance and partiality. The omniscience of God relieves him from the charge of the first; and as partiality supposes a diminution of happiness in deciding against a favorite, and as God in the nature of things is incapable of either an increase or diminution of bliss, it follows, that He is wholly impartial. Again: as the questions at issue in the judgment will not be between men and men as parties to a suit, but between men individually and the Divine government, there will be no occasion for the exercise of partiality. The decisions, therefore, of the final judgment, over which the Lord Jesus Christ will preside, will be perfectly just, and void of all partiality.

The common objections to the equity of the Divine administration, when investigated, will be found to be groundless. 'How is it consistent with your notions of God's government,' we are asked, 'for vice to prosper and for virtue to be distressed? Is it not daily observable,' continues the skeptic, 'that the persons whom you represent as transgressors of His laws, and who are consequently under His displeasure, appear to abound in happiness, while, on the other, the obedient seem often distressed and miserable?' To such questions we reply,—That to be rich and honorable is not to abound in bliss; nor, is to be poor and despised always to be miserable. How often do sadness and melancholy furrow the cheek of the potentate, while cheerfulness and joy redden the countenance of the peasant? Contentment, too, oftener erects its shrine by the fireside of the humble hamlet, than amid the gorgeous tapestry of the palace! And even if it were the reverse during this short-lived state of being; even if the virtuous poor were miserable, and the vicious opulent were quiet and tranquil in their minds, still to such skepticisms we might say,—

> 'Shall little haughty ignorance pronounce
> His works unwise, of which the smallest part
> Exceeds the narrow compass of her mind?
> A critic fly, whose feeble ray scarce spreads
> An inch around, with blind presumption bold
> Should dare to tax the structure of the whole—
> As if, upon a full-proportion'd dome,
> On swelling columns heaved, the pride of art.'

Else with the pious Cowper we will say,—

> 'Blind unbelief is sure to err,
> And scan His works in vain;
> God is His own interpreter,
> And He will make it plain.'

Another and farther view of this subject will set it forth in its proper light. In order for the exercise of judgment, there must be time and opportunity afforded, as well for the violation of the laws as for obedience to them. Thus our courts sit to try causes which originate in the interval of their sessions. Now, let us consider all the time which has elapsed since the foundation of the world, and all the time which shall elapse before the day of judgment, which the Scriptures declare shall ere long arrive, in the same point of view as the intervals between the sittings of our earthly courts. Or, shall we say the Divine court has not yet commenced its session! But, when it shall begin, it will adjust every apparent discrepance. The proud oppressor will then be

brought low, and punished for his crimes; while he who had been the pious object of his tyranny will be exalted upon the wreck, and enriched by the ruins of the tyrant's prosperity.

'His purposes will ripen fast
Unfolding every hour;
The bud may have a bitter taste,
But sweet will be the flower.'

It is a truth, upon the undoubted authority of revelation, that the books of God shall be opened, and every man shall be rewarded according to his works.

3. As well as Lawgiver and Judge, almighty God is the executive officer of His own government.

It is the duty of this department to defend the subjects or citizens in the enjoyment of their political franchises, and to carry into execution the decisions of the courts.

If we consider what are the franchises of the people with regard to the Divine government, we shall find the Deity to be not in the least deficient in His executive character. It is true, the oppression of one man exerted against another is an affliction. Let us remember, that it is no part of the franchises extended to the subjects of this government to be free from afflictions in the present world. On the contrary our Savior expressly informed His disciples, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation.' And as our rewards to be hereafter received will doubtless be apportioned according to the extent of our trials, they are rather to be esteemed blessings than otherwise, as affording us the opportunity of reaping a brighter reward. To be freed from them, therefore, we ought not to consider as one of the franchises of our Divine citizenship, whether they proceed from the persecutions of men, or from any other source. But the love of God shed abroad in the heart; the witness of the Holy Spirit with our spirits; the right to the 'incorruptible inheritance,' enjoyed by all those who obey the Gospel,—these are the privileges, these the franchises which God protects from the assaults of every foe. 'For I am persuaded that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.' And why, St. Paul? Because thou wast 'kept by the power of God, through faith unto salvation.'

The same Power which defends and finally rewards the saint, will be potent enough to carry into execution every sentence of condemnation which may be pronounced against the sinner at that awful and tremendous bar. We conclude, therefore, that 'the Lord God omnipotent reigneth,' as a benevolent, all-wise, and all-powerful Sovereign.

III. The duties of the rational creation, to Him whose throne is the habitation of righteousness, need not occupy much of our time to point out.

1. The prominent duty (in which, indeed, the rest are involved) is that which our text suggests; a cheerful and cordial acquiescence in the principles and operations of the Deity's reign. Alleluia is the language of rejoicing; and, alleluia cry the angels and the hosts of heaven. But angels alone are not to be glad. In the verse immediately preceding, St. John tells us, 'A voice came out of the throne,

saying, Praise our God all ye His servants, and ye that fear Him, both small and great.' Similar to which, the psalmist: 'The Lord reigneth, let the people of the earth rejoice.' Nor is there any discordance between this admonition and another, which declares, 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth tremble.' For the very same reason that the servants of God and those that fear Him should rejoice, should the careless and disobedient tremble; because He announces to the latter, 'Except ye repent, ye shall perish.' And a horror and a trembling are the first steps to repentance. Or should they never repent, they have need to tremble at the lake of fire into which they will inevitably be cast.

2. But why these loud alleluias, begun on earth, and to be perpetuated to eternity? Go to the deistical skeptic: though his ideas be vague and doubtful, yet will he give you the true answer. He will inform you, as the foundation of his fallacious creed, (a wrong edifice built on a solid basis,) that the benevolent Deity cannot *design* His creatures to be otherwise than happy and joyful. We agree with him in this opinion entirely. Now, rejoicing is nothing but *the expression* of joy and felicity. These God designed us to possess. And when by obedience to His commands we fulfil His beneficent designs, ought we not to express what we feel and enjoy? Should we not be candid and sincere? Should we look gloomy and sorrowful, when our hearts are teeming with buoyancy and cheerfulness? God forbid. 'Tis not only meet and right to rejoice, but it is our duty. Therefore, 'rejoice my soul, again I say, rejoice.'

'Let all the sons of Adam raise,
The honors of their God.'

Dr. Young has said,—

''Tis impious in the good man to be sad,'

and an inspired apostle, 'Rejoice evermore.' But what reason does the author of the Revelation assign for this emphatic expression of joyful homage? 'For'—then he assigns the reason—'for, the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.' The very fact that such a Being presides over the counsels of the universe is reason enough to induce every good man to rejoice. Men may impugn his motives, or slander his reputation; they may call him an impostor or a hypocrite; cast out his name as evil, and say all manner of evil against him falsely; yea, they may hurry him, by the hand of violence, into the ocean of eternity: yet God is his everlasting Rock!

'Whom thou dost guard, O King of kings!
No evil shall molest;
Under the shadow of thy wings
May we securely rest.'

Do temptations harass me? I hear a voice from the throne of the Omnipotent: 'No temptation shall overtake you, but such as you shall be able to bear.' Does Satan rage? That same voice encourages me: 'Resist the devil, and he will flee from you.' Does the world allure me by its wily fascinations, or persecute me by its vindictive cruelty?—'Be not dismayed, I have overcome the world.'

Finally: the Judge of all the earth will at last make His appearance,

to execute vengeance upon His adversaries, and on them that obey not the Gospel. The terrific thunders of His wrath will peal through the wide and trackless expanse of immensity; while the lightning's vivid glare will flash confusion and dismay around this melting orb. What horror among the sons of Belial will the rod of vindictive justice strike, and what shrieks of despair from souls unready for the scene! Yet in the midst of this catastrophe of nature, amid the clamor and the crash of dissolving worlds, methinks I hear the faithful Christian exultingly shout, 'Alleluia! the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.'

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

As the writer of the following strictures thinks that Mr. Sunderland has advanced doctrines dangerous to Methodism, we publish them, that our readers may hear both sides of the question. We think, however, that the author of the Essay has been misapprehended in what he has said about educating men *before* they enter the ministry. We understood him to mean by this, before they should be received into the *itinerancy* by an annual conference; and that even such should give evidence to the proper authorities of the Church, of their *Divine* call to this work, by exhibiting their 'gifts, grace, and usefulness,' *before* they should be thus theologically trained. That this was in fact the author's meaning is evident from the following words, found in note on page 426:—'It affords me pleasure in being able to add here, that since this Essay was written, a course of literary and theological study has been specified by the New-England conference, which all persons must have pursued *before* they can be *admitted on trial* in that body.' This, therefore, is what is meant by requiring a certain course of theological training *before* they enter the ministry.

If he meant any thing else—if he meant that we should select young men *merely* because they gave evidence of piety, or even no such evidence, and train them up for the ministry in the same manner, and under the influence of the same motive, that men are educated for other professions, namely, that 'they may eat a morsel of bread,' then we think Mr. Sunderland has advanced a dangerous doctrine, entirely adverse to Methodism and to the Divine order of things, as developed in the writings of the New Testament; and hence this part of the Essay, so understood, has our decided disapprobation.

But if, on the other hand, the author meant to say, that a young man professing to be called of God to the ministry, at the same time furnishing a Scriptural evidence of the reality of his call, should be thoroughly trained, in some way, previous to his entrance on the work of the itinerancy, it has our most hearty approbation, and we believe

also, the approbation of the Methodist Episcopal Church: the only difference between the doctrine of the Essay and the practice of the Church is, that the former thinks a training in a theological school is the better way, while the Church has thought that it can be better accomplished by some other means; and on this question, while we leave every one to think for himself, we shall hereafter give our own views with all possible frankness.

There is another particular in which the author of the following strictures seems, in our humble judgment, to misconceive the views of the Essay. Mr. Sunderland says that the Methodist Episcopal Church has never made any provision for the education of her ministers. This is thought to be a reproach upon the Church, and in fact libelous, inasmuch as it is contended that provision has been made. But we would ask *when* and *what sort* of provision the Methodist Episcopal Church has ever made, either directly or indirectly, for the education of her ministers? Has she ever contributed one cent for this purpose? We know of no instance of the kind. It may be said that the Discipline requires the ministers to study and acquire knowledge. We allow it. But is this making *provision* for them? You require a hungry man to eat, but you furnish him with no food. Is this making *provision* for his sustenance? The mere requiring a man to study, without furnishing him with the means, is but mocking his necessity. He has neither time nor money at his command, nor, in many instances, even if he had these, for the want of the initiating instruction, is he able so to pursue his studies as to be of any material advantage to him.

It may be moreover affirmed that the Church has furnished the means by printing and circulating the needful books. Alas for this meagre affirmation! Has she ever given these books to her ministers? No, not one cent's worth. They have to purchase them with their own money, or go without them. And now tell us, ye who make this affirmation, whether you think that from the small pittance allowed to a Methodist preacher, (not one half of even this meagre allowance is ever received by many of them,) he can spare enough from his pressing wants to purchase a library—such a library as becomes the shelves of a minister of the Lord Jesus? He must literally starve to be able to do this. Beside, until very recently, there has been scarcely a book either published or kept on sale, at the Methodist Book Room, such as a minister needs to instruct him in that sort of knowledge which is peculiar to his profession. But very few of the books we have been able, by screwing and twisting, to collect together, were purchased at this establishment. We allow that latterly the catalogue has been considerably increased by valuable commentaries, and a few other books of science; but even yet, were a minister to confine himself to this

catalogue, he would have but a meagre library. Allowing, however, that it included all that is necessary, it alters not the state of the question: the ministers must pay the cash for them the same as others, bating one third discount, or be without them.

We affirm, therefore, without any fear of contradiction, from those who understand the subject, and are candid, *that the Methodist Episcopal Church has never made any provision for the education of her ministers—and therefore he who asserts this is guilty of no slander.* We are not now inquiring whether this is right or wrong. It is the mere fact after which we inquire. If it be right to require of her ministers to study so many books, so many hours in the day, without furnishing them with the means to procure the books, and the needful key to understand and profit by them, why then let her persevere in this course. On the other hand, if convinced that more ought to be done to elevate the character of her ministry, by furnishing them with the means to acquire knowledge, let her repent of the past, and amend in future.

On the whole we think the essayist is fully borne out by facts, that the Church has done nothing to aid her ministers in procuring for themselves that information that they need for a faithful and successful discharge of their duty. Some, to be sure, in despite of the discouragements thrown in their way, by great pecuniary sacrifices, and private personal exertions, have risen to some degree of eminence in general literature, and in theological knowledge; but they have had to wend their way in the best manner they could, unaided, except by the God of providence and grace, and often in the midst of scorn and contempt, in the intricate path of knowledge and usefulness.

But although the Church has been thus deficient in furnishing the pecuniary means and other incitements to her ministers for the acquirement of useful knowledge, in other respects she has acquitted herself in a way which demands the gratitude of all her sons in the Gospel. But for the luminous manner in which her doctrines have been exhibited by her founders and others of her able ministers, and the operation of her wholesome and Scriptural discipline, where might we have been? No one feels himself more indebted to the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the fostering care of both her ministers and people than we do in all these respects; and hence the deep solicitude we feel for her growth and prosperity, for the perpetuity of her institutions, for the enlargement of her borders, and for her rising glory among the Churches of Christendom; and therefore may say, in the language of the psalmist, 'Let my right hand forget its cunning, if I forget thee, O Jerusalem.'

Another exception which has been taken to the Essay under consideration is, that it slanders the Methodist Episcopal Church, by

saying that she requires no sort of learning of any candidate for license to preach *before* he is licensed. Now we believe this is also true to a certain extent. If there be any such rule in the Discipline as requires specific *literary* acquirements, it has escaped our notice. And we believe, moreover, that the practice has conformed to this view of the subject. If we are not greatly deceived, persons have been licensed to preach, as local preachers, who could not even read the Bible. We are not now inquiring whether *this* is right or wrong, but simply as to the fact: the Essay asserts that it is even so, and we fully believe it.

We know indeed that the Discipline requires of *travelling* preachers, and of those who design to enter the travelling ministry, that they should enter on a course of study, and thus become qualified for ministerial duty; but the question now is, Does the Church require any specific literary qualification *before* receiving license to preach? If she does, we shall be obliged to any one to point us to it.

We know indeed that it is required of all those who receive license to preach, that they should profess their faith in our doctrine, government, and usages; but we know equally well that it does not require *literary* acquirements to do all this: a man may be orally taught the leading doctrines of the Gospel, and he may see exemplified before his eyes the government and usages of the Church, and hence may understand and cordially believe and acquiesce in all these, without specific *literary* qualifications.

But though this appears to be the fact, that there are no specific literary attainments laid down in the Discipline, to which a person must attain *before* he receives license to preach, it is, we believe, generally understood, with the exceptions to which we have alluded, of persons wholly illiterate being licensed to preach (which cases occur chiefly among the colored and Indian local preachers) that those who come forward as candidates for the ministry should have acquired a knowledge at least of their own language, should be well read in the Scriptures, in our standard authors, and be thoroughly conversant in the doctrines and discipline of the Church. We think, therefore, that Mr. Sunderland has not been sufficiently guarded on this point, in giving the Church credit for what she does at least *expect*, and by her usage *demand* at the hands of those who design to enter her enclosure as the expounders and defenders of her doctrines, government, and usages. But so far as an absolute rule or authority is concerned, we think he is unquestionably right.

Nor do we think that the author of the following strictures has evaded the force of the above remarks, by quoting that part of the Discipline which requires *gifts*, as well as *grace* and *usefulness*, of those who profess to be moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel—a *sound*

understanding in the things of God, and *a ready utterance*; for a man may have all these, and yet be as illiterate as are many of the orators of our forests, whose native understandings will compare with any of the most learned among civilized nations. A man may have a sound understanding naturally, and if truly converted, in the things of God, and also have a ready utterance, so as to speak fluently, and yet be totally ignorant of letters. On the contrary, a man may have studied all his days, and have acquired much literary information, and yet, in consequence of a naturally defective understanding, he may not be qualified to be a minister of Jesus Christ, though pious; he may be, after all, but a learned dolt.

We understand, therefore, by a sound understanding and gifts, those natural talents which a man possesses, anterior to artificial acquirements, and which, when a man is truly converted to God, enable him to apprehend and speak the truths of religion intelligibly. These, we allow, are required of a man *before* he enters upon the work of the ministry. But *after* he has entered, we think our Church requires, as an 'indispensable prerequisite' to his *continuance* therein, that he should study, acquire, perseveringly, *theological knowledge:* else what does she mean by saying, in her book of Discipline, to those who have 'no taste for this,' that they must 'return to their former employment?' Is not this an indispensable condition of their *remaining* among us, just as evidently as we have made it appear that it is *not* an indispensable prerequisite for their *commencement* in this work?

This much we have thought it our duty to say by way of animadversion on the strictures which follow. As to the doctrines of the Essay, let them stand or fall on their own merits. We never supposed that an editor is bound to endorse all that he admits into his columns, especially when a communication is accompanied with the proper name of the writer, nor, on the other hand, to reject any piece that is offered, thus vouched, because it may contain some things with which the editor may disagree; for if this were the case, we surely should not publish the strictures which follow. Respecting, however, the general doctrine contained in the Essay, we will here declare our sentiments with all freedom and frankness.

1. *As to theological schools.* If, when these are plead for, it is understood that they are designed to educate young men for the ministry, the same way and under the same circumstances that a man is educated for any other profession, without any regard to his being divinely called to that work, we are no advocate for them, but would oppose them with all our might. Nor do we believe that either brother Sunderland, nor any other of their advocates among us, ever designed to plead for schools of this character—we have never so understood it. On the other hand, we believe that that sort of piety which arises

out of a sound conversion to God, and that sort of a call to the ministry which is denominated a being 'moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon him that office,' and that evidence of this Divine call which appears in 'gifts, grace, and usefulness,' are indispensable prerequisites to a Gospel minister. But we have long thought, and still think, that where these prerequisites do appear, and yet the young man is deficient in general literature, and especially in theological knowledge, it would be a great help to him, and highly beneficial to the Church he may be called to serve, to be put in a way to acquire the requisite instruction. And as every body knows that a person will learn as much in a month with the aid of a competent instructer, as he would in six months without one, we have believed, and do still believe, that a provision of this sort made for *such* young candidates for the ministry, would greatly aid us in our work. These are our most matured thoughts: nor do we think that they are either 'heretical,' or 'anti-Methodistical,' much less 'anti-Christian;' for if every thing is heretical and anti-Methodistical that has not yet been incorporated into the system, then every measure, until it is introduced, has the character, and should be branded with the hateful and dreaded epithet of 'anti-Methodistical.' That only is such which strikes at the root, or would impair the energies, of any existing doctrine, rule, or usage; and although we have not penetration enough to perceive that such a regulation would do either the one or the other, those who think otherwise must guard against its introduction, and we shall cheerfully acquiesce.

And here permit us to make a few remarks on theological schools. These, in the character they now sustain, are of recent origin. Formerly it was the custom, when a young man was sent to college, by the time he graduated, for his parents or guardians to fix upon the profession they designed him to follow. And such was the low state of religion in the Churches, that without sufficient attention to spiritual qualifications, such as were destined for the Christian ministry were set apart for that purpose, and sometimes, on leaving college, they were put under the tuition of some divine, for the purpose of receiving private instruction in the science of Christianity. Hence the disrepute into which such ministers have fallen. Having little else beside their learning to recommend them as ministers of the sanctuary, they were incompetent to instruct mankind in the great doctrines of God our Savior, and more especially inadequate to teach them the experimental truths of godliness.

On the revival of experimental and practical religion, during the last century, this defective mode of preparing men for the Christian ministry began to be sensibly and extensively felt and deprecated. Hence originated the theological schools for the education of *pious* young men. Into these schools none but those who profess piety, and who

give such evidences of it as to satisfy those concerned that they have it, are admitted. Whether they fix the standard of piety high enough, and whether they insist as much as they ought upon the inward call of the Holy Ghost, is another question. We are inclined to think they do not; for we are very far from believing that every pious young man is called, or can become qualified to preach the Gospel of Christ; in addition to piety, and other literary and mental qualifications, he must be specially moved by the Holy Spirit to take upon him the sacred office of the ministry. It is respecting such, and *only* such, that we speak as being proper persons to receive that theological training which is needful for a successful discharge of ministerial duty.

And here permit us to correct an error which seems to us to pervade the minds of all those who think and speak on this subject by way of objection. It seems to be taken for granted that when we speak of educating young men for the ministry, our attention is directed chiefly, if not wholly, to a study of the languages, and the common branches of a collegiate education. This is an entire mistake. Though these things are good in their place, and even very desirable as great helps to a minister of Christ, yet we consider a thorough knowledge of Christian theology, as it may be taught in our own language only, the main thing to be insisted upon. If a young man, who gives evidence of his call to preach the Gospel, has not and cannot have an opportunity to acquire a knowledge of the dead languages, and of other branches of science generally taught in a college course, at least he ought thoroughly to understand his own language; he should cultivate an acquaintance with logic, rhetoric, moral and intellectual philosophy, history, particularly ecclesiastical history, and geography; and *above all*, with that Biblical knowledge, which will enable him to understand, explain, enforce, and defend every doctrine and precept of the Holy Scriptures, in language plain, chaste, and energetic; moreover, his mind should be thoroughly imbued with the graces of the Holy Spirit, and be taught, by his own experience, that without His constant aid and efficient influence, no good thought or action can be produced.

This is the sort of training that we wish all young ministers to receive. It is not, therefore, that dry, scholastic divinity, which is chiefly, and for the most part uselessly, occupied about mere speculative points of divinity, which few can understand, and fewer yet explain, that we wish to be taught. It is that sort of training which will teach them to bring all their learning, all their powers, natural and acquired, to make truth, the truth of God, bear on the understandings and consciences of their hearers. We wish them to be taught to feel that their 'sufficiency is of God;' that they must, for a faithful and successful discharge of their duty, be 'good men, full of faith and the Holy Ghost.' And cannot these truths be enforced upon young men in a

school with the same effect as they could be in a church or in a private room? We care not how a knowledge of these things is acquired, so that it be obtained.

This leads us to notice another inaccurate view which we think the writer of the strictures has taken of what Mr. Sunderland has said respecting Mr. Wesley's education for the ministry. It is stated in the Essay, that 'Mr. Wesley was made a minister precisely in the same way that education societies make ministers now.' This the writer thinks is a reflection upon Mr. Wesley. Wherefore? Why because Mr. Wesley was *afterward* converted, and therefore was made a minister of Jesus Christ by the Holy Spirit. And does Mr. Sunderland deny this? By no means. What he affirms is, that Mr. Wesley was trained up in the college at Oxford for a minister of the established Church of England, and that in *this* respect there was a similarity between his theological training and the training of those who are now educated in theological schools for the ministry. And is not all this true? Did not Mr. Wesley, according to his own words, as quoted by the author of the strictures, study divinity *before*, as well as *after*, he was ordained deacon and priest? Most certainly he did. And therefore his doing so is proof in point of the doctrine of the Essay, that in Mr. Wesley's case an education *before* entering upon the ministry was deemed essential. Mr. Wesley, then, was made a minister in the Church of England, so far as learning and a theological training is concerned, nearly 'in the same way that ministers are now made in theological seminaries:'—there is, however, this difference, in which we think the essayist is not entirely correct: Mr. Wesley was not selected by the Church as a pious young man, and sent to a theological school to study under a set of professors devoted exclusively to theological teaching; but he began from a conviction of duty, after finishing his classical studies, to turn his attention to theological subjects. We should judge therefore that his *theological* training was less perfect, in some respects, while at college, than that which is imparted to theological students in those seminaries which are now set apart exclusively for candidates for the Gospel ministry.

But has any man a right to infer from hence that we believe, or that Mr. Sunderland meant to assert, that this was the *only* qualification which Mr. Wesley had for preaching the Gospel? We think not. We all know, that after Mr. Wesley was thus educated, thus set apart by the imposition of hands for the Christian ministry, he received new light, was born of the Spirit, and called of God, through the agency of the Holy Ghost, to 'preach the unsearchable riches of Christ.'—And what does all this prove? That it is *wrong* for a man to study *before* he enters upon the ministry? Nothing less? It proves directly the reverse. Else why did not God curse instead of bless Mr. Wesley in this work of preparation?

On the whole, we think the remarks of the writer under consideration on this branch of the subject wholly uncalled for and unjustifiably severe. Mr. Wesley was educated expressly for the ministry, and he finally became, in the order of Divine Providence, one of the holiest, most successful, and eminent evangelical ministers, which ever adorned and dignified the Church of Christ since the days of plenary inspiration; and hence we think that his whole course, both in his preparatory studies, his initiation into the ministry, as well as his after life, was ordered by the Hand that cannot err. Would that we had thousands of others like him!

We would not insinuate that the writer of the strictures is opposed to theological learning. We know he is not. His objections are founded on the assumption that Mr. Sunderland, and those who enter into his views, are advocates for training up young men for the ministry without a proper regard to their piety and Divine call to the ministry, the same as a man is educated for any of the learned professions. And so far as his objections are levelled against this sort of education, we most heartily unite with him, still believing that such ministers are a curse to the Church. His remarks themselves give too much evidence of his love of learning, and of his familiarity with the sciences, to allow us one moment to suppose that he can be opposed to sound scholarship in any set of men. It is therefore the *abuse*, or the wrong application of learning, against which he lifts up his voice; and we hence flatter ourselves, that when he and Mr. Sunderland, both of whom are alike estimable in our account, shall understand each other, they will most cordially agree on this important point.

2. As to *classical learning*, we never did, nor do we now, believe, that it is essential to a Gospel minister; any more than the theological training before mentioned, in precisely that way,—though we believe at the same time, other things being equal, it is a great help to all such ministers. Let it be taken for granted, therefore, as an admitted truth on all hands;—and if any doctrine of the Essay can be fairly construed to mean otherwise, we hereby discard it;—*that to make a true minister of Jesus Christ, a man must be called to it by the Holy Ghost, be anointed from on high to preach the Gospel;* and that before the Church should license a person thus called, she must have satisfactory evidence, by beholding his 'gifts, grace, and usefulnesss,' that he has been so called, and so qualified. It is respecting all such, and such only, that we wish, if they have not already received it, they should be put in a way to receive a competent education. If they have been, or can consistently be, classically taught, all the better; but if not, let them labor to the best advantage they can without it, using, in the meantime, all the helps within their reach to acquire sound and useful knowledge.

3. Respecting such ministers, who have been called as above described, who lack these qualifications, we never have believed, nor do we now believe, that they cannot profit the people, or that they ought to desist from preaching. On the contrary, we believe that there have been, and are still, ministers in the Church exceedingly illiterate, understanding that term in its classical acceptation, who have been, and are now, eminently useful, have been made a blessing to thousands, and who still continue to edify the Church, by their evangelical labors, in all holiness and spiritual happiness. Hence it follows, that it never entered into our hearts to suppose that these literary acquirements, however desirable and useful they may be, are indispensable prerequisites to a Gospel minister. God forbid that we should thus disparage ourselves and the most of our brethren. Such a thought never entered our hearts; no, not for one moment. All that we have meant is this, that when such are called to the Christian ministry, it then becomes their indispensable duty to use all the helps within their reach to acquire that sort of knowledge especially, which will enable them to understand, explain, and enforce the truths of sacred Scripture, and to discharge, to the best advantage, all those duties which are connected with their high and responsible office;—we believe that both God and the Discipline of our Church require this at their hand;—and that they are solemnly pledged to do this in their ordination vows. Are we in error in this particular? If we are, let any brother convict us, and we will correct ourselves.

We moreover believe, that if such persons could procure the help of some competent teacher, either privately or publicly, as the case may be, it would greatly facilitate their progress. Are we heretical in this belief? Let the heresy be pointed out and we will relinquish it.

Having thus discharged what we consider a solemn duty to a valued correspondent, and freely and frankly declared our own views and convictions, we submit the following strictures to our readers, not indeed, as we have before said, because we think them just in all respects, but because the writer and some others think, that Mr. Sunderland has advanced dangerous, and in some instances, anti-Methodistical doctrines; and because we are willing that our readers should hear both sides of the question, and then judge for themselves.

Since the above was written we cast our eyes upon the following Address of Mr. Wesley to the Clergy, which we most affectionately commend to all our readers. It may be found in the sixth volume of his works, page 217:—

Brethren and Fathers,—Let it not be imputed to forwardness, vanity, or presumption, that one who is of little esteem in the Church takes upon him thus to address a body of people, to many of whom he owes the highest reverence. I owe a still higher regard to Him whom I believe requires this at my hands;

to the great Bishop of our souls; before whom both you and I must shortly give an account of our stewardship. It is a debt I owe to love, to real, disinterested affection, to declare what has long been the burden of my soul. And may the God of love enable you to read these lines in the same spirit wherewith they were wrote! It will easily appear to an unprejudiced reader, that I do not speak from a spirit of anger or resentment. I know well, 'the wrath of man worketh not the righteousness of God.' Much less would I utter one word out of contempt: a spirit justly abhorred by God and man. Neither of these can consist with that earnest, tender love, which is the motive of my present undertaking. In this spirit I desire to cast my bread upon the waters; it is enough if I find it again after many days.

Meantime, you are sensible, love does not forbid, but rather require, plainness of speech. Has it not often constrained you, as well as me, to lay aside, not only disguise, but reserve also; and 'by manifestation of the truth to commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God?' And while I endeavor to do this, let me earnestly entreat you, for the love of God, for the love of your own soul, for the love of the souls committed to your charge, yea, and of the whole Church of Christ, do not bias your mind, by thinking *who* it is that speaks; but impartially consider *what* is spoken. And if it be false or foolish, reject it; but do not reject 'the words of truth and soberness.'

My first design was, to offer a few plain thoughts to the clergy of our own Church only. But upon farther reflection, I see no cause for being so 'straitened in my own bowels.' I am a debtor to all; and therefore, though I primarily speak to them with whom I am more immediately connected, yet I would not be understood to exclude any, of whatsoever denomination, whom God has called to 'watch over the souls of others, as they that must give account.'

In order to our giving this account with joy, are there not two things which it highly imports us to consider: First, What manner of men ought we to be? Secondly, Are we such, or are we not?

I. And, First, if we are 'overseers over the Church of God, which he hath bought with his own blood,' what manner of men ought we to be, in gifts as well as in grace?

1. To begin with gifts; and, (1.) With those that are from nature. Ought not a minister to have, First, a good understanding, a clear apprehension, a sound judgment, and a capacity of reasoning with some closeness? Is not this necessary in a high degree for the work of the ministry? Otherwise, how will he be able to understand the various states of those under his care; or to steer them through a thousand difficulties and dangers, to the haven where they would be? Is it not necessary, with respect to the numerous enemies whom he has to encounter? Can a fool cope with all the men that know not God, and with all the spirits of darkness? Nay, he will neither be aware of the devices of Satan, nor the craftiness of his children.

Secondly. Is it not highly expedient that a guide of souls should have likewise some liveliness and readiness of thought? Or how will he be able, when need requires, to 'answer a fool according to his folly?' How frequent is this need! seeing we almost every where meet with those empty, yet petulant creatures, who are far 'wiser in their own eyes, than seven men that can render a reason.' Reasoning, therefore, is not the weapon to be used with them. You cannot deal with them thus. They scorn being convinced; nor can they be silenced but in their own way.

Thirdly. To a sound understanding, and a lively turn of thought, should be joined a good memory; if it may be, ready, that you may make whatever occurs in reading or conversation your own; but, however retentive, lest we be 'ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth.' On the contrary, 'every scribe instructed unto the kingdom of heaven,' every teacher fitted for his work, 'is like a householder, who bringeth out of his treasures things new and old.'

2. And as to acquired endowments, can he take one step aright, without first a competent share of knowledge? a knowledge, First, of his own office; of the high trust in which he stands, the important work to which he is called? Is there any hope that a man should discharge his office well, if he knows not what it is? that he should acquit himself faithfully of a trust, the very nature whereof he does not understand? Nay, if he knows not the work God has given him to do, he cannot finish it.

Secondly. No less necessary is a knowledge of the Scriptures, which teach us how to teach others; yea, a knowledge of all the Scriptures; seeing scripture interprets scripture; one part fixing the sense of another. So that, whether it be true or not, that every good textuary is a good divine, it is certain none can be a good divine who is not a good textuary. None else can be mighty in the Scriptures; able both to instruct and to stop the mouths of gainsayers.

In order to do this accurately, ought he not to know the literal meaning of every word, verse, and chapter; without which there can be no firm foundation on which the spiritual meaning can be built? Should he not likewise be able to deduce the proper corollaries, speculative and practical, from each text; to solve the difficulties which arise, and answer the objections which are or may be raised against it; and to make a suitable application of all to the consciences of his hearers?

Thirdly. But can he do this, in the most effectual manner, without a knowledge of the original tongues? Without this, will he not frequently be at a stand, even as to texts which regard practice only? But he will be under still greater difficulties with respect to controverted scriptures. He will be ill able to rescue these out of the hands of any man of learning that would pervert them; for whenever an appeal is made to the original, his mouth is stopped at once.

Fourthly. Is not a knowledge of profane history, likewise, of ancient customs, of chronology and geography, though not absolutely necessary, yet highly expedient, for him that would throughly understand the Scriptures; since the want even of this knowledge is but poorly supplied by reading the comments of other men?

Fifthly. Some knowledge of the sciences also, is, to say the least, equally expedient. Nay, may we not say, that the knowledge of one, (whether art or science,) although now quite unfashionable, is even necessary next, and in order to the knowledge of the Scripture itself? I mean logic. For what is this, if rightly understood, but the art of good sense? of apprehending things clearly, judging truly, and reasoning conclusively? What is it, viewed in another light, but the art of learning and teaching; whether by convincing or persuading? What is there, then, in the whole compass of science, to be desired in comparison of it?

Is not some acquaintance with what has been termed the second part of logic, (metaphysics,) if not so necessary as this, yet highly expedient, (1.) In order to clear our apprehension, (without which it is impossible either to judge correctly, or to reason closely or conclusively,) by ranging our ideas under general heads? And, (2.) In order to understand many useful writers, who can very hardly be understood without it?

Should not a minister be acquainted, too, with at least the general grounds of natural philosophy? Is not this a great help to the accurate understanding several passages of Scripture? Assisted by this, he may himself comprehend, and on proper occasions explain to others, how the invisible things of God are seen from the creation of the world; how 'the heavens declare the glory of God, and the firmament showeth his handy work;' till they cry out, 'O Lord, how manifold are thy works! In wisdom hast thou made them all.'

But how far can he go in this, without some knowledge of geometry? which is likewise useful, not barely on this account, but to give clearness of apprehension, and a habit of thinking closely and connectedly.

It may be allowed indeed, that some of these branches of knowledge are not so indispensably necessary as the rest; and therefore no thinking man will condemn the fathers of the Church, for having, in all ages and nations, appointed some to the ministry, who, suppose they had the capacity, yet had not had the opportunity of attaining them. But what excuse is this for one who has the opportunity, and makes no use of it? What can be urged for a person who has had a university education, if he does not understand them all? Certainly, supposing him to have any capacity, to have common understanding, he is inexcusable before God and man.

Sixthly. Can any who spend several years in those seats of learning, be excused if they do not add to that of the languages and sciences, the knowledge of the fathers? the most authentic commentators on Scripture, as being both nearest the fountain, and eminently endued with that Spirit by whom all Scripture was given. It will be easily perceived, I speak chiefly of those who wrote before the Council of Nice. But who would not likewise desire to have some

acquaintance with those that followed them? with St. Chrysostom, Basil, Jerome, Austin; and above all, the man of a broken heart, Ephraim Syrus?

Seventhly. There is yet another branch of knowledge highly necessary for a clergyman, and that is, knowledge of the world; a knowledge of men, of their maxims, tempers, and manners, such as they occur in real life. Without this he will be liable to receive much hurt, and capable of doing little good; as he will not know, either how to deal with men according to the vast variety of their characters, or to preserve himself from those who almost in every place lie in wait to deceive.

How nearly allied to this is the discernment of spirits! so far as it may be acquired by diligent observation. And can a guide of souls be without it? If he is, is he not liable to stumble at every step?

Eighthly. Can he be without an eminent share of prudence? that most uncommon thing which is usually called common sense? But how shall we define it? Shall we say with the schools, that it is *recta ratio rerum agibilium particularium?* [A right regard of particular things which may be done?] Or is it an habitual consideration of all the circumstances of a thing,—

Quis, quid, ubi, quibus auxiliis, cur, quomodo, quando? [Who, what, where, with what helps, why, how, when?] and a facility of adapting our behavior to the various combinations of them? However it be defined, should it not be studied with all care, and pursued with all earnestness of application? For what terrible inconveniences ensue, whenever it is remarkably wanting.

Ninthly. Next to prudence or common sense, (if it be not included therein,) a clergyman ought certainly to have some degree of good breeding; I mean address, easiness, and propriety of behavior, wherever his lot is cast: perhaps one might add, he should have (though not the stateliness; for he is 'the servant of all,' yet) all the courtesy of a gentleman, joined with the correctness of a scholar. Do we want a pattern of this? We have one in St. Paul, even before Felix, Festus, King Agrippa. One can scarce help thinking he was one of the best bred men, one of the finest gentlemen in the world. O that we likewise had the skill to 'please all men for their good unto edification!'

In order to this, especially in our public ministrations, would not one wish for a strong, clear, musical voice, and a good delivery, both with regard to pronunciation and action? I name these here, because they are far more acquirable than has been commonly imagined. A remarkably weak and untunable voice has by steady application become strong and agreeable. Those who stammered almost at every word, have learned to speak clearly and plainly. And many who were eminently ungraceful in their pronunciation and awkward in their gesture, have in some time, by art and labor, not only corrected that awkwardness of action and ungracefulness of utterance, but have become excellent in both, and in these respects likewise the ornaments of their profession.

What may greatly encourage those who give themselves up to the work, with regard to all these endowments, many of which cannot be attained without considerable labor, is this: They are assured of being assisted in all their labor by Him who teacheth man knowledge. And who teacheth like Him? Who, like Him, giveth wisdom to the simple? How easy is it for Him, (if we desire it, and believe that He is both able and willing to do this,) by the powerful, though secret, influences of his Spirit, to open and enlarge our understanding; to strengthen all our faculties; to bring to our remembrance whatsoever things are needful, and to fix and sharpen our attention to them; so that we may profit above all who depend wholly on themselves, in whatever may qualify us for our Master's work!

3. But all these things, however great they may be in themselves, are little in comparison of those that follow. For what are all other gifts, whether natural or acquired, when compared to the grace of God? And how ought this to animate and govern the whole intention, affection, and practice of a minister of Christ?

(1.) As to his intention, both in undertaking this important office, and in executing every part of it, ought it not to be singly this, to glorify God, and to save souls from death? Is not this absolutely and indispensably necessary, before all and above all things? 'If his eye be single, his whole body,' his whole soul, his whole work, 'will be full of light.' 'God who commanded light to shine out of darkness,' will shine on his heart; will direct him in all his ways, will give him to see the travail of his soul, and be satisfied. But if his eye, his intention, be not single, if there be any mixture of meaner motives (how much more, if those were

or are his leading motives in undertaking or exercising this high office!) his 'whole body,' his whole soul, 'will be full of darkness,' even such as issues from the bottomless pit: let not such a man think that he shall have any blessing from the Lord. No; the curse of God abideth on him. Let him not expect to enjoy any settled peace, any solid comfort, in his own breast; neither can he hope there will be any fruit of his labors, any sinners converted to God.

(2.) As to his affections. Ought not a 'steward of the mysteries of God,' a shepherd of the souls for whom Christ died, to be endued with an eminent measure of love to God, and love to all his brethren? a love the same in kind, but in degree far beyond that of ordinary Christians? Can he otherwise answer the high character he bears, and the relation wherein he stands? Without this, how can he go through all the toils and difficulties which necessarily attend the faithful execution of his office? Would it be possible for a parent to go through the pain and fatigue of bearing and bringing up even one child, were it not for that vehement affection, that inexpressible στοργη, which the Creator has given for that very end? How much less will it be possible for any pastor, any spiritual parent, to go through the pain and labor of 'travailing in birth for,' and bringing up, many children to the measure of the full stature of Christ, without a large measure of that inexpressible affection which 'a stranger intermeddleth not with!'

He therefore must be utterly void of understanding, must be a madman of the highest order, who, on any consideration whatever, undertakes this office, while he is a stranger to this affection. Nay, I have often wondered that any man in his senses does not rather dig or thresh for a livelihood than continue therein, unless he feels at least (which is *extremâ lineâ amare*) [to love in the highest degree] such an earnest concern for the glory of God, and such a thirst after the salvation of souls, that he is ready to do any thing, to lose any thing, or to suffer any thing, rather than one should perish for whom Christ died.

And is not even this degree of love to God and man utterly inconsistent with the love of the world; with the love of money or praise; with the very lowest degree of either ambition or sensuality? How much less can it consist with that poor, low, irrational, childish principle, the love of diversions? (Surely even a man, were he neither a minister nor a Christian, should 'put away childish things.') Not only this, but the love of pleasure, and, what lies still deeper in the soul, the love of ease flees before it.

(3.) As to his practice: 'Unto the ungodly, saith God, Why dost thou preach my laws?' What is a minister of Christ, a shepherd of souls, unless he is all devoted to God? unless he abstain, with the utmost care and diligence, from every evil word and work; from all appearance of evil; yea, from the most innocent things, whereby any might be offended or made weak? Is he not called, above others, to be an example to the flock, in his private as well as public character? an example of all holy and heavenly tempers, filling the heart so as to shine through the life? Consequently, is not his whole life, if he walks worthy of his calling, one incessant labor of love; one continued tract of praising God, and helping man; one series of thankfulness and beneficence? Is he not always humble, always serious, though rejoicing evermore; mild, gentle, patient, abstinent? May you not resemble him to a guardian angel, ministering to those 'who shall be heirs of salvation?' Is he not one sent forth from God, to stand between God and man, to guard and assist the poor, helpless children of men, to supply them both with light and strength, to guide them through a thousand known and unknown dangers, till at the appointed time he returns with those committed to his charge, to his and their Father who is in heaven?

O who is able to describe such a messenger of God, faithfully executing His high office! working together with God, with the great Author both of the old and of the new creation! See his Lord, the eternal Son of God, going forth on that work of omnipotence, and creating heaven and earth by the breath of His mouth! See the servant whom He delighteth to honor, fulfilling the counsel of His will, and in His name speaking the word whereby is raised a new spiritual creation. Empowered by Him, he says to the dark, unformed void of nature, 'Let there be light; and there is light. Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new.' He is continually employed, in what the angels of God have not the honor to do,—co-operating with the Redeemer of men in 'bringing many children to glory.'

Such is a true minister of Christ; and such, beyond all possibility of dispute, ought both you and I to be.

II. But are we such? What are we in the respects above named? It is a melancholy but necessary consideration. It is true, many have wrote upon this subject; and some of them admirably well: yet few, if any, at least in our nation, have carried their inquiry through all these particulars. Neither have they always spoken so plain and home as the nature of the thing required. But why did they not? Was it because they were unwilling to give pain to those whom they loved? or were they hindered by fear of disobliging, or of incurring any temporal inconvenience? Miserable fear! Is any temporal inconvenience whatever to be laid in the balance with the souls of our brethren; or were they prevented by shame, arising from a consciousness of their own many and great defects? Undoubtedly this might extenuate the fault, but not altogether remove it. For is it not a wise advice, 'Be not ashamed when it concerneth thy soul?' especially when it concerns the souls of thousands also? In such a case may God

> Set as a flint our steady face,
> Harden to adamant our brow!

But is there not another hinderance? Should not compassion, should not tenderness hinder us from giving pain? Yes, from giving unnecessary pain. But what manner of tenderness is this? It is like that of a surgeon who lets his patient be lost because he is too compassionate to probe his wounds. Cruel compassion! Let me give pain, so I may save life. Let me probe, that God may heal.

1. Are we then such as we are sensible we should be, First, with regard to natural endowments? I am afraid not. If we were, how many stumbling blocks would be removed out of the way of serious infidels? Alas, what terrible effects do we continually see of that common though senseless imagination, 'The boy, if he is fit for nothing else, will do well enough for a parson!' Hence it is, that we see (I would to God there were no such instance in all Great Britain or Ireland!) dull, heavy, blockish ministers; men of no life, no spirit, no readiness of thought; who are consequently the jest of every pert fool, every lively, airy coxcomb they meet. We see others whose memory can retain nothing; therefore they can never be men of considerable knowledge; they can never know much even of those things which they are most nearly concerned to know. Alas, they are pouring the water into a leaky vessel; and the broken cistern can hold no water! I do not say, with Plato, that 'all human knowledge is nothing but remembering.' Yet certain it is, that, without remembering, we can have but a small share of knowledge. And even those who enjoy the most retentive memory, find great reason still to complain,

> Skill comes so slow, and life so fast does fly;
> We learn so little, and forget so much!

And yet we see and bewail a still greater defect in some that are in the ministry. They want sense, they are defective in understanding, their capacity is low and shallow, their apprehension is muddy and confused; of consequence, they are utterly incapable either of forming a true judgment of things, or of reasoning justly upon any thing. O how can these who themselves know nothing aright, impart knowledge to others? how instruct them in all the variety of duty to God, their neighbor, and themselves? How will they guide them through all the mazes of error, through all the entanglements of sin and temptation? How will they apprise them of the devices of Satan, and guard them against all the wisdom of the world?

It is easy to perceive I do not speak this for their sake; (for they are incorrigible;) but for the sake of parents, that they may open their eyes and see, a blockhead can never 'do well enough for a parson.' He may do well enough for a tradesman; so well as to gain fifty or a hundred thousand pounds. He may do well enough for a soldier; nay, (if you pay well for it,) for a very well-dressed and well-mounted officer. He may do well enough for a sailor, and may shine on the quarter deck of a man-of-war. He may do so well, in the capacity of a lawyer or physician, as to ride in his gilt chariot. But O! think not of his

being a minister, unless you would bring a blot upon your family, a scandal upon our Church, and a reproach on the Gospel, which he may murder, but cannot teach.

Are we such as we are sensible we should be, Secondly, with regard to acquired endowments? Here the matter (suppose we have common understanding) lies more directly within our own power. But under this, as well as the following heads, methinks I would not consider at all, how many or how few are either excellent or defective. I would only desire every person who reads this to apply it to himself. Certainly some one in the nation is defective. Am not I the man?

Let us each seriously examine himself. Have I, (1.) Such a knowledge of Scripture, as becomes him who undertakes so to explain it to others, that it may be a light in all their paths? Have I a full and clear view of the analogy of faith, which is the clue to guide me through the whole? Am I acquainted with the several parts of Scripture; with all parts of the Old Testament and the New? Upon the mention of any text, do I know the context, and the parallel places? Have I that point at least of a good divine, the being a good textuary? Do I know the grammatical construction of the four Gospels; of the Acts; of the epistles; and am I a master of the spiritual sense (as well as the literal) of what I read? Do I understand the scope of each book, and how every part of it tends thereto? Have I skill to draw the natural inferences deducible from each text? Do I know the objections raised to them or from them by Jews, Deists, Papists, Arians, Socinians, and all other sectaries, who more or less corrupt or cauponize the word of God? Am I ready to give a satisfactory answer to each of these objections? And have I learned to apply every part of the sacred writings, as the various states of my hearers require?

(2.) Do I understand Greek and Hebrew? Otherwise, how can I undertake, (as every minister does,) not only to explain books which are written therein, but to defend them against all opponents? Am I not at the mercy of every one who does understand, or even pretends to understand, the original? For, which way can I confute his pretence? Do I understand the language of the Old Testament? critically? at all? Can I read into English one of David's Psalms; or even the first chapter of Genesis? Do I understand the language of the New Testament? Am I a critical master of it? Have I enough of it even to read into English the first chapter of St. Luke? If not, how many years did I spend at school? How many at the university? And what was I doing all those years? Ought not shame to cover my face?

(3.) Do I understand my own office? Have I deeply considered before God the character which I bear? What is it to be an ambassador of Christ, an envoy from the King of heaven? And do I know and feel what is implied in 'watching over the souls' of men 'as he that must give account?'

(4.) Do I understand so much of profane history as tends to confirm and illustrate the sacred? Am I acquainted with the ancient customs of the Jews and other nations mentioned in Scripture? Have I a competent knowledge of chronology, that at least which refers to the sacred writings? And am I so far (if no farther) skilled in geography, as to know the situation, and give some account of all the considerable places mentioned therein?

(5.) Am I a tolerable master of the sciences? Have I gone through the very gate of them, logic? If not, I am not likely to go much farther, when I stumble at the threshold. Do I understand it so as to be ever the better for it? to have it always ready for use; so as to apply every rule of it, when occasion is, almost as naturally as I turn my hand? Do I understand it at all? Are not even the moods and figures above my comprehension? Do not I poorly endeavor to cover my ignorance, by affecting to laugh at their barbarous names? Can I even reduce an indirect mood to a direct; an hypothetic to a categorical syllogism? Rather, have not my stupid indolence and laziness made me very ready to believe, what the little wits and pretty gentlemen affirm, 'that logic is good for nothing?' It is good for this at least, (wherever it is understood,) to make people talk less; by showing them both what is, and what is not, to the point; and how extremely hard it is to prove any thing. Do I understand metaphysics; if not the depths of the schoolmen, the subtleties of Scotus or Aquinas, yet the first rudiments, the general principles, of that useful science? Have I conquered so much of it, as to clear my apprehension, and range my ideas under proper heads; so much as enables me to read with ease and pleasure, as well as profit, Dr. Henry Moore's

Works, Malebranche's 'Search after Truth,' and Dr. Clarke's 'Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God?' Do I understand natural philosophy? If I have not gone deep therein, have I digested the general grounds of it? Have I mastered Gravesande, Keill, Sir Isaac Newton's Principia, with his 'Theory of Light and Colors?' In order thereto, have I laid in some stock of mathematical knowledge? Am I master of the mathematical A B C of Euclid's Elements? If I have not gone thus far, if I am such a novice still, what have I been about ever since I came from school?

(6.) Am I acquainted with the fathers; at least with those venerable men who lived in the earliest ages of the Church? Have I read over and over the golden remains of Clemens Romanus, of Ignatius and Polycarp; and have I given one reading, at least, to the works of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Cyprian?

(7.) Have I any knowledge of the world? Have I studied men, (as well as books,) and observed their tempers, maxims, and manners? Have I learned to beware of men; to add the wisdom of the serpent to the innocence of the dove? Has God given me by nature, or have I acquired, any measure of the discernment of spirits; or of its near ally, prudence, enabling me on all occasions to consider all circumstances, and to suit and vary my behavior according to the various combinations of them? Do I labor never to be rude or ill mannered; not to be remarkably wanting in good breeding? Do I endeavor to copy after those who are eminent for address and easiness of behavior? Am I (though never light or trifling, either in word or action, yet) affable and courteous to all men? And do I omit no means which is in my power, and consistent with my character, of 'pleasing all men' with whom I converse, 'for their good to edification?'

If I am wanting even in these lowest endowments, shall I not frequently regret the want? How often shall I move heavily, and be far less useful than I might have been! How much more shall I suffer in my usefulness, if I have wasted the opportunities I once had of acquainting myself with the great lights of antiquity, the Ante-Nicene fathers; or if I have droned away those precious hours wherein I might have made myself master of the sciences! How poorly must I many times drag on, for want of the helps which I have vilely cast away! But is not my case still worse, if I have loitered away the time wherein I should have perfected myself in Greek and Hebrew? I might before this have been critically acquainted with these treasuries of sacred knowledge. But they are now hid from my eyes; they are close locked up, and I have no key to open them. However, have I used all possible diligence to supply that grievous defect, (so far as it can be supplied now,) by the most accurate knowledge of the English Scriptures? Do I meditate therein day and night? Do I think (and consequently speak) thereof, 'when I sit in the house, and when I walk by the way; when I lie down, and when I rise up?' By this means have I at length attained a thorough knowledge, as of the sacred text, so of its literal and spiritual meaning? Otherwise how can I attempt to instruct others therein? Without this, I am a blind guide indeed! I am absolutely incapable of teaching my flock what I have never learned myself; no more fit to lead souls to God, than I am to govern the world.

2. And yet there is a higher consideration than that of gifts; higher than any or all of these joined together; a consideration in view of which all external and all intellectual endowments vanish into nothing. Am I such as I ought to be, with regard to the grace of God? The Lord God enable me to judge aright of this!

And, (1.) What was my intention in taking upon me this office and ministry? What was it, in taking charge of this parish, either as minister or curate? Was it always, and is it now, wholly and solely to glorify God, and save souls? Has my eye been singly fixed on this, from the beginning hitherto? Had I never, have I not now, any mixture in my intention; any alloy of baser metal? Had I, or have I, no thought of worldly gain; 'filthy lucre,' as the apostle terms it? Had I at first, have I now, no secular view? no eye to honor or preferment? to a plentiful income; or, at least, a competency? a warm and comfortable livelihood?

Alas! my brother! 'If the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness!' Was a comfortable livelihood, then, your motive for entering into the ministry? And do you avow this in the face of the sun, and without one blush upon your cheek? I cannot compare you with Simon Magus; you are many

degrees beneath him. He offered to give money for the gift of God, the power of conferring the Holy Ghost. Hereby, however, he showed that he set a higher value on the gift, than on the money which he would have parted with for it. But you do not; you set a far higher value on the money than on the gift; insomuch that you do not desire, you will not accept of the gift, unless the money accompany it! The bishop said, when you was ordained, 'Receive thou the Holy Ghost.' But that was the least of your care. Let who will receive this, so you receive the money, the revenue of a good benefice. While you minister the word and sacraments before God, He gives the Holy Ghost to those who duly receive them: so that, 'through your hands,' likewise, 'the Holy Ghost is,' in this sense, 'given' now. But you have little concern whether He be or not; so little, that you will minister no longer, He shall be given no more either through your lips or hands, if you have no more money for your labor. O Simon, Simon! what a saint wert thou, compared to many of the most honorable men now in Christendom!

Let not any either ignorantly or wilfully mistake me. I would not 'muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn.' I know the spiritual 'laborer,' too, 'is worthy of his reward;' and, that, if 'we sow unto' our flock 'spiritual things,' it is meet that we 'reap of their carnal things.' I do not therefore blame, no, not in any degree, a minister's taking a yearly salary; but I blame his seeking it. The thing blamable is the having it in his view, as the motive, or any part of the motive, for entering into this sacred office.

Hic nigræ succus loliginis, hæc est,
Ærugo mera,

['This is fell poison's blackest juice.'—BOSCAWEN.]

If preferment, or honor, or profit, was in his eye, his eye was not single. And our Lord knew no medium between a single and an evil eye. The eye, therefore, which is not single is evil. It is a plain, adjudged case. He then that has any other design in undertaking or executing the office of a minister than purely this, to glorify God and save souls, his eye is not single. Of consequence, it is evil; and therefore his 'whole body' must be 'full of darkness.' 'The light which is in' him 'is' very 'darkness;' darkness covers his whole soul; he has no solid peace; he has no blessing from God; and there is no fruit of his labors.

It is no wonder that they who see no harm in this, see no harm in adding one living to another, and, if they can, another to that; yet still wiping their mouth, and saying, they have done no evil. In the very first step, their eye was not single; therefore their mind was filled with darkness. So they stumble on still in the same mire, till their feet 'stumble on the dark mountains.'

It is pleaded, indeed, that 'a small living will not maintain a large family.' *Maintain!* How? It will not clothe them 'in purple and fine linen;' nor enable them to fare 'sumptuously every day:' but will not the living you have now afford you and yours the plain necessaries, yea, and conveniences, of life? Will it not maintain you in the frugal, Christian simplicity which becomes a minister of Christ? It will not maintain you in pomp and grandeur, in elegant luxury, in fashionable sensuality. So much the better. If your eyes were open, whatever your income was, you would flee from these as from hell fire.

It has been pleaded, Secondly, 'By having a larger income, I am able to do more good.' But dare you aver, in the presence of God, that it was singly with this view, only for this end, that you sought a larger income? If not, you are still condemned before God; your eye was not single. Do not therefore quibble and evade. This was not your motive of acting. It was not the desire of doing more good, whether to the souls or bodies of men; it was not the love of God: (you know it was not; your own conscience is as a thousand witnesses:) but it was 'the love of money,' and 'the desire of other things,' which animated you in this pursuit. If, then, the word of God is true, you are in darkness still: it fills and covers your soul.

I might add, a larger income does not necessarily imply a capacity of doing more spiritual good. And this is the highest kind of good. It is good to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked: but it is a far nobler good to 'save souls from death,' to 'pluck' poor 'brands out of the burning.' And it is that to which you are peculiarly called, and to which you have solemnly promised to 'bend all your studies and endeavors.' But you are by no means sure, that, by adding a second

living to your first, you shall be more capable of doing good in this kind, than you would have been had you laid out all your time, and all your strength, on your first flock.

'However, I shall be able to do more temporal good.' You are not sure even of this. 'If riches increase, they are increased that eat them.' Perhaps your expenses may rise proportionably with your income. But if not, if you have a greater ability, shall you have a greater willingness, to do good? You have no reason in the world to believe this. There are a thousand instances of the contrary. How many have less will when they have more power! Now they have more money, they love it more; when they had little, they did their 'diligence gladly to give of that little;' but since they have had much, they are so far from 'giving plenteously,' that they can hardly afford to give at all.

'But by my having another living, I maintain a valuable man, who might otherwise want the necessaries of life.' I answer, (1.) Was this your whole and sole motive in seeking that other living? If not, this plea will not clear you from the charge; your eye was not single. (2.) If it was, you may put it beyond dispute; you may prove at once the purity of your intention:—make that valuable man rector of one of your parishes, and you are clear before God and man.

But what can be pleaded for those who have two or more flocks, and take care of none of them? who just look at them now and then for a few days, and then remove to a convenient distance, and say, 'Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease; eat, drink, and be merry?'

Some years ago I was asking a plain man, 'Ought not he who feeds the flock, to eat of the milk of the flock?' He answered: 'Friend, I have no objection to that. But what is that to him who does not feed the flock? He stands on the far side of the hedge, and feeds himself. It is another who feeds the flock; and ought he to have the milk of the flock? What canst thou say for him?' Truly, nothing at all; and he will have nothing to say for himself, when the great Shepherd shall pronounce that just sentence, 'Bind' the unprofitable servant 'hand and foot, and cast him into outer darkness.'

I have dwelt the longer on this head, because a right intention is the first point of all, and the most necessary of all; inasmuch as the want of this cannot be supplied by any thing else whatsoever. It is the setting out wrong; a fault never to be amended, unless you return to the place whence you came, and set out right. It is impossible therefore to lay too great stress upon a single eye, a pure intention; without which, all our sacrifice, our prayers, sermons, and sacraments, are an abomination to the Lord.

I cannot dismiss this important article, without touching upon one thing more. How many are directly concerned therein, I leave to the Searcher of hearts.

You have been settled in a living or a curacy for some time. You are now going to exchange it for another. Why do you do this? For what reason do you prefer this before your former living or curacy? 'Why, I had but fifty pounds a year where I was before, and now I shall have a hundred.' And is this your real motive of acting? the true reason why you make the exchange? 'It is: and is it not a sufficient reason?' Yes, for a heathen; but not for one who calls himself a Christian.

Perhaps a more gross infatuation than this was never yet known upon earth. There goes one who is commissioned to be an ambassador of Christ, a shepherd of never dying souls, a watchman over the Israel of God, a steward of the mysteries which 'angels desire to look into.' Where is he going? 'To London, to Bristol, to Northampton.' Why does he go thither? 'To get more money.' A tolerable reason for driving a herd of bullocks to one market rather than the other; though if a drover does this without any farther view, he acts as a heathen, not a Christian. But what a reason for leaving the immortal souls over whom the Holy Ghost had made you overseer! And yet this is the motive which not only influences in secret, but is acknowledged openly, and without a blush! Nay, it is excused, justified, defended; and that not by a few, here and there, who are apparently void both of piety and shame; but by numbers of seemingly religious men, from one end of England to the other!

(2.) Am I, Secondly, such as I ought to be, with regard to my affections? I am taken from among, and ordained for, men, in things pertaining to God. I stand between God and man, by the authority of the great Mediator, in the nearest and most endearing relation both to my Creator and to my fellow creatures. Have I accordingly given my heart to God, and to my brethren for His

sake? Do I love God with all my soul and strength? and my neighbor, every man, as myself? Does this love swallow me up, possess me whole, constitute my supreme happiness? Does it animate all my passions and tempers, and regulate all my powers and faculties? Is it the spring which gives rise to all my thoughts, and governs all my words and actions? If it does, not unto me, but unto God be the praise! If it does not, 'God be merciful to me a sinner!'

At least, do I feel such a concern for the glory of God, and such a thirst after the salvation of men, that I am ready to do any thing, however contrary to my natural inclination, to part with any thing, however agreeable to me, to suffer any thing, however grievous to flesh and blood, so I may save one soul from hell? Is this my ruling temper at all times and in all places? Does it make all my labor light? If not, what a weariness is it! what a drudgery! Had I not far better hold the plough?

But is it possible this should be my ruling temper, if I still love the world? No, certainly; if I 'love the world, the love of the Father is not in me.' The love of God is not in me, if I love money, if I love pleasure, so called, or diversion. Neither is it in me, if I am a lover of honor or praise, or of dress, or of good eating and drinking. Nay, even indolence, or the love of ease, is inconsistent with the love of God.

What a creature then is a covetous, an ambitious, a luxurious, an indolent, a diversion-loving clergyman! Is it any wonder that infidelity should increase, where any of these are to be found? that many, comparing their spirit with their profession, should blaspheme that worthy name whereby they are called? But 'wo be unto him by whom the offence cometh! It were good for that man if he had never been born.' It were good for him now, rather than he should continue to turn the lame out of the way, 'that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the depth of the sea!'

(3.) May not you, who are of a better spirit, consider, Thirdly, Am I such as I ought to be, with regard to my practice? Am I, in my private life, wholly devoted to God? Am I intent upon this one thing, to do in every point 'not my own will, but the will of Him that sent me?' Do I carefully and resolutely abstain from every evil word and work? 'from all appearance of evil?' from all indifferent things, which might lay a stumbling block in the way of the weak? Am I zealous of good works? As I have time, do I do good to all men? and that in every kind, and in as high a degree as I am capable?

How do I behave in the public work whereunto I am called,—in my pastoral character? Am I 'a pattern' to my 'flock, in word, in behavior, in love, in spirit, in faith, in purity?' Is my 'word,' my daily conversation, 'always in grace,' always 'meet to minister grace to the hearers?' Is my behavior suitable to the dignity of my calling? Do I walk as Christ also walked? Does the love of God and man not only fill my heart, but shine through my whole conversation? Is the spirit, the temper which appears in all my words and actions, such as allows me to say with humble boldness, Herein 'be ye followers of me, as I am of Christ?' Do all who have spiritual discernment take knowledge (judging of the tree by its fruits) that 'the life which I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God;' and that in all 'simplicity and godly sincerity I have my conversation in the world?' Am I exemplarily pure from all worldly desire, from all vile and vain affections? Is my life one continued labor of love, one tract of praising God and helping man? Do I in every thing see 'Him who is invisible?' And 'beholding with open face the glory of the Lord,' am I 'changed into the same image from glory to glory, by the Spirit of the Lord?'

Brethren, is not this our calling, even as we are Christians; but more eminently as we are ministers of Christ? And why (I will not say, do we fall short, but why) are we satisfied with falling so short of it? Is there any necessity laid upon us, of sinking so infinitely below our calling? Who hath required this at our hands? Certainly, not He by whose authority we minister. Is not His will the same with regard to us, as with regard to His first ambassadors? Is not His love, and is not His power still the same, as they were in the ancient days? Know we not that Jesus Christ 'is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever?' Why then may not you be as 'burning and as shining lights,' as those that shone seventeen hundred years ago? Do you desire to partake of the same burning love, of the same shining holiness? Surely you do. You cannot but be sensible it is the greatest blessing which can be bestowed on any child of man. Do you design it; aim at it; 'press on to' this 'mark of the prize of the high calling of God in

Christ Jesus?' Do you constantly and earnestly pray for it? Then, as the Lord liveth, ye shall attain. Only let us pray on, and 'tarry at Jerusalem, till we be endued with power from on high.' Let us continue in all the ordinances of God, particularly in meditating on His word, 'in denying ourselves, and taking up our cross daily,' and, 'as we have time, doing good to all men;' and then assuredly 'the great Shepherd' of us and our flocks will 'make us perfect in every good work to do His will, and work in us all that is well pleasing in His sight!' This is the desire and prayer of your brother and servant, in our common Lord,

JOHN WESLEY.

London, February 6, 1756.

It will be seen by the above that Mr. Wesley supports our views of the difference between *natural and acquired gifts*, and the proper place which learning ought to hold in the Christian ministry. We hope, therefore, that we may no longer be accused of being 'anti-Methodistical,' and especially 'anti-Wesleyan,' for urging the importance of a sound theological education.

BRIEF STRICTURES

ON THE REV. MR. SUNDERLAND'S 'ESSAY ON THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.'

By David Meredith Reese, M. D.

MR. EDITOR,—The 'Essay on Theological Education,' by Rev. La Roy Sunderland, and published in the last number of your Magazine, being now spread before the Church under a more imposing form than when published in a pamphlet by the author, seems to me to call for animadversion and criticism, which otherwise might have been unnecessary. And while I freely award to the author all the credit to which he may be entitled for his zeal in behalf of the cause of *improvement in the education of our ministry;* and while I admit that this cause is one worthy of the attention of the whole Church; and while at the same time I heartily approve of every well-directed effort to elevate the literary character both of our ministry and laity; yet I must confess, that I regard the Essay to which I refer, as highly exceptionable in many of its parts, and in some of them inconsistent either with Methodism or Christianity. It is from this deliberate conviction that I deem it a duty, notwithstanding the humble station I hold in the Church, to remonstrate against the doctrines of this Essay, thus early in their introduction among us, lest the author and kindred spirits, if there be such, may be emboldened by the silence of the Church to repeat the promulgation of sentiments, which I am constrained to charge, as being heretical in fact and in form.

That the author of the Essay may not even now be aware of the effects it is likely to produce, and that he did not contemplate arraying himself against the highest authorities of our Church, is freely admitted. Indeed, its appearance in our Magazine affords prima facie evidence that the unmethodistical doctrines it advocates were overlooked by the sagacious editor himself, or he would not have given them circulation.

The first assertion which follows the repetition of the truisms by which the Essay is introduced, is in the following words:—

'The Bible and ecclesiastical history unite in the testimony, that, by nearly every Christian Church, which has ever been distinguished by the Divine approbation, a *theological education* has been considered an *indispensable prerequisite* for persons *entering* upon the Gospel ministry.' The same oracular announcement is repeated on a subsequent page as follows:—

'A *theological education*—an education expressly adapted to the work of preaching the Gospel—has been considered an *indispensable qualification* in all persons who *enter upon* the duties of the Christian ministry, by the great proportion of the Church of God, from the earliest ages of the world.'

These broad and unqualified declarations of a 'junior preacher,' if it were not for the trifling fault that they are utterly unauthorized and unfounded, would utterly disfranchize three fourths of the Methodist ministry in the United States, both travelling and local, including this 'junior preacher' himself, and annihilate also the clerical character of a very large proportion of evangelical ministers in

most other denominations. It is no vindication to say that the author did not mean to go so far,—it is sufficient for me to prove that *this* '*Essay' does.*

The 'theological education' for which the author contends, as being an 'indispensable prerequisite,' '*before* they commence the work of the ministry,' and which he affirms has the authority of 'almost every Church which has ever existed, from the days of St. John to the present time;' 'excepting, of course, our own people as a Church,' since he insists that 'the Methodist Church, as one body, from the beginning, has formed an exception;' this 'theological training' he has clearly defined, so that his meaning cannot be misunderstood. The following sentences, some in his own words, and some in the 'language of another,' but adopted in his Essay, are here appealed to.

'What I mean to say is, and the time, in my opinion, has come to say this very distinctly, that henceforward a *three years' course of study in theology* is short enough, as a general rule. If any one is providentially prevented from pursuing it, that should be submitted to as his *calamity!*'

Again: 'In the first schools of Europe, established for the two *great* professions, LAW and MEDICINE, the period of study is three, four, and in some cases five years, *superadded to an academical education.* But is the care of men's *immortal* interests a *business* that demands less maturity of *preparation*, than that of their *bodies or estates?*'

'Beside, is a young man of course qualified to be a religious teacher, because he is ardently pious? Then *theological seminaries* and *education societies* are a useless incumbrance to the world!' 'If preparation is necessary, GOD *has decided* that *vacant churches* and *perishing sinners* must WAIT till the preparation is made by *study;* for it is not now made by miracles.'

The foregoing extracts from the Essay are quoted from the Rev. Dr. Porter, then president of the theological seminary at Andover. And in proof that the author goes the whole with him, he says, '*These are just such views*, as I *would to God* were engraven upon the heart of *every member* in the *Methodist Episcopal Church.*' And he adds, 'I think I may say, that from personal knowledge I have given in the foregoing remarks the sentiments of the MOST *enlightened*, *pious*, and *useful* members both of our ministry and membership, throughout the country.'

Now these 'views,' and 'remarks,' and 'sentiments,' it cannot be concealed, are none other than a plea for 'theological seminaries,' a training in which, is declared to be an '*indispensable prerequisite*' '*before* entering upon the Gospel ministry.' To reconcile us to this we are told that 'the idea of *theological seminaries* among the Methodists is not something *new*, as many suppose, and their establishment *would not be an innovation* on the *original plan* of Wesley!' Indeed we are told that 'the Wesleys themselves were trained and educated for this sacred work *in the very way* of which we have been speaking.' Nay more: he affirms that John Wesley 'was *made* a minister *precisely* as the education societies *make ministers* at the present day!' Indeed we are sagely informed, that 'it does not alter the case at all whether suitable persons are led into the Gospel field through the medium of an *education society*, or a *quarterly*, or an *annual* conference.' And after a *sneer* at those 'Methodists of the present day who *sicken* at the thought of educating men *for* the Gospel ministry,' we are told that John Fletcher was once 'the president of a theological seminary, at the same time that he was a Methodist.'

On these several topics I now proceed briefly to remark: and in reprobating such views, condemning such sentiments, and denying such assertions, as are here contained, I choose to incur the hazard of being excluded by this writer from the company of the '*most enlightened*, *pious*, *and useful* members' of the Church, for such he claims as sentimentally agreeing with him. This, however, I no more admit or believe, than I do his other affirmations, a few of which I shall attempt to disprove.

I. I deny that a 'theological education,' such as that for which the author pleads, is an '*indispensable* prerequisite for persons entering upon the duties of the Christian ministry,' or that such has been the sentiment or usage of the Christian Church 'from the earliest ages.' And here I shall waive all reference to the forced analogy attempted between the 'schools of the prophets' in the days of Samuel, and theological seminaries, as it is altogether too puerile to need refutation; and the other schools at Alexandria, Cesarea, &c, are equally irrelevant, as every reader of their history well understands. Indeed, the 'superior learning and extraordinary qualifications' of both the teachers and students of

scholastic divinity in any of these ancient or modern schools, have never been rendered a blessing to the Church, nor have any of them been distinguished for *ministerial* success or usefulness in the Church of God. But to come more directly to the question at issue, I affirm that the introduction of 'theological seminaries' for training young men *for* the ministry, and 'education societies,' organized 'expressly for the purpose of *finding out*, and encouraging suitable persons to *seek* an education for the ministry,' are *innovations* into the Christian Church of very modern date, unknown to Christ or his apostles, or to the Christian fathers, in any ancient Church which has ever been 'distinguished by the Divine approbation.' And, moreover, I regard such societies and seminaries, founded on such principles, as in their nature adverse to the purity of the Gospel ministry, and in their tendency pernicious in the highest degree. They are founded on the anti-Christian sentiment, that the duty of preaching the Gospel is a 'business,' a trade, a secular profession, like '*law* and *medicine*,' requiring a similar '*training*,' as an 'indispensable prerequisite,' and hence a 'three years' course of study' is insisted upon as an *indispensable* qualification. But the tendency of such institutions as already developed, and they have been experimenting but a few years comparatively, has been 'evil, only evil, and that continually.' Young men, who are unfit for any and every other occupation, or have fallen through in some more appropriate vocation, have been 'trained' for the ministry, and having acquired the '*indispensable* prerequisite,' have been proclaimed as '*competent* ministers,' to the exclusion of their less learned, but more evangelical brethren, and Christian Churches in our land by hundreds are now groaning under the burden of these men-made ministers, and souls by thousands are 'perishing for lack of knowledge around them, while they are consoling themselves with the reflection that they have been regularly *trained* in a theological seminary, and possess the 'indispensable prerequisite' for the '*business*' of preaching the Gospel, by their 'three years' course of study.' It is a well-authenticated fact, that the greatest drones in the Gospel ministry, idlers in the vineyard, and useless cumberers of the ground, who now afflict and curse the Church, are among those who glory in their theological education and ministerial training, instead of the cross of Christ; while it is equally notorious, that among the most useful and successful preachers in this and other lands, hundreds and thousands are found, whom the Holy Ghost has thrust out into the work, without the 'indispensable prerequisite,' and who, though deficient in the 'enticing words of man's wisdom,' are 'mighty in the Scriptures,' 'full of faith,' and 'anointed with the unction of the Holy One.' God almighty has put His seal upon them, by living epistles known and read of all men.

II. I maintain, that the 'idea of theological seminaries is something *new* in Methodism, and that it is an *innovation* upon the original plan of Mr. Wesley,' the assertion to the contrary notwithstanding. Nay more: no man can find, in all Mr. Wesley said or wrote, any shadow of evidence that he would have endured the proposition, that his preachers, '*before* entering upon the work of the ministry,' should go through a 'three years' course of study,' much less that *any* literary or theological training should be regarded as an '*indispensable* prerequisite.' It is well known that his authority in the premises was supreme; his will was law; and had he desired any such 'training,' no man knew better how to provide it and enforce it than he. We know, indeed, that his predilection for *Church order* caused him to hesitate in the case of that man of God, Mr. Maxfield, for example, but when his mother communicated her opinion that he was 'as much *called of God to preach*' as her son was, and bade him 'examine the *fruits* of his preaching,' this settled the question, and he says he 'could not venture to forbid him.' In this case however, as in every other, his scruples did not turn on his want of 'theological training,' or of human learning, but solely in reference to ecclesiastical authority; for he had never heard of a 'theological seminary,' nor dreamed of such a 'course,' as an 'indispensable,' or even desirable 'prerequisite.' Accordingly, in the minutes of one of his earliest conferences we have the following explicit declaration of his views on the subject of the call and qualifications for the ministry, which has been unchanged by his successors in England, and is incorporated into our own book of Discipline, to the present hour, by the act of the supreme authorities of the Methodist E. Church, viz.

'Q. How shall we try those who think they are *moved by the Holy Ghost*, and *called of God to preach?*

'A. Inquire, First, Do they know God as a pardoning God? Have they the

love of God abiding in them? Do they desire and seek nothing but God? And are they holy in all manner of conversation?

'Second. Have they gifts (as well as grace) for the work? Have they a clear, sound understanding? Have they a right judgment in the things of God? Have they a just conception of salvation by faith? And has God given them any degree of utterance? Do they speak justly, readily, clearly?

'Third. Have they fruit? Are any truly convinced of sin, and converted to God by their preaching?

'As long as *these marks* concur in any, we believe he is *called of God* to preach.'

And is it possible, that neither Wesley, nor Methodism any where knows any thing of the '*indispensable prerequisite*' of this 'junior preacher?' Not a word like this. Has he entered a 'theological seminary?' Has he gone through a 'three years' course of study?' Has he been trained for the ministry by an 'education society' 'organized for the purpose of *finding out* and encouraging such persons?' Not a word. But we are told that the times have 'altered since the days of Wesley.' Truly they have, or this Essay had never been written by a Methodist preacher, either junior or senior. But is it not strange that the general conference of 1832 had not then light enough to discover, that the '*indispensable prerequisite*' 'before entering upon the Gospel ministry' is a literary and theological training, and that they did not amend the Discipline accordingly?

But although this criterion, by which Mr. Wesley and our Church universal, have ever decided the question of a call to the ministry, is our supreme ecclesiastical law, yet we find the author of the Essay under notice, who is a member and minister of the Church, complains most grievously that we '*keep* our Discipline,' and do not 'mend it,' and hence he asks among other grave queries, 'Do we not say, in the constant practice of our quarterly and annual conferences, that if one has gifts, grace, and a sound understanding, [and fruits?] it is enough?' Certainly we do, and while we are Methodists we must continue to do so, for to say any thing else is to be '*without law, and above law*,' and in thus quarrelling with the usages of the Church on this subject, the author is found 'inveighing against the Discipline,' which is regarded among us as a high misdemeanor.

In an attempt to show some semblance of authority for the reference made to Mr. Wesley's 'original plan,' as furnishing justification of 'theological seminaries among the Methodists,' allusion is made to the 'seminary for laborers' which was in contemplation by that holy man, as early as 1744 and 1745, but never consummated; and the sentiments of Dr. Clarke, Mr. Watson, and others friendly to *such* an organization are also appealedt o. Indeed we are not only told that Lady Huntingdon's school, was a 'theological seminary' when Mr. Fletcher had the charge of it, but reference is made to the proposed institution, now in its infancy, among our brethren in England, and this too is called a 'theological seminary,' and all this is represented as confirmatory of the doctrines of this Essay. How far any of these allusions contribute to the object of the writer will presently appear.

With respect to Mr. Wesley's 'seminary for laborers' it will not be pretended that had it been established, it would have borne any, the least resemblance to a 'theological seminary,' such as that for which the author contends. The 'laborers' were those who were already in the work of the ministry, his 'helpers' and 'assistants,' and none but such were ever contemplated as its beneficiaries. He never thought of training young men, 'pious' or 'indigent' though they be, *for* the ministry; but after the great Head of the Church had designated them as 'laborers' in the vineyard, then, and not till then, did he wish provision for their literary and theological improvement. And, accordingly, in the absence of the 'seminary' he enforced the '*subserviency* of literature to usefulness in the ministry' and enjoined upon his preachers a 'large course of theological and general reading.' In these opinions and in this practice, Dr. Clarke, Mr. Watson, and the authorities of the Wesleyan Methodists, as well as those of the Methodist Episcopal Church, have always concurred, and are more and more diligent in inculcating. In no other way can these names be justly appealed to on the subject.

III. The allusion made by the author of the Essay to the recent act of the British conference is singularly unfortunate for his purpose, as will appear for the following reasons:—

First. It is called 'the Wesleyan Theological Institution, for the improvement of the junior *preachers*.' Here is nothing about the indispensable prerequisite, *before* they enter upon the work of preaching the Gospel: for they must be *preachers* '*before*' they enter the institution.

Second. The qualifications for admission are, that they must be '*preachers* who have passed the examinations required by our rules, obtained the consent of their respective quarterly meetings, and the recommendation of the superintendents and district meetings, and shall have been placed by the conference on the president's *list of reserve*, and *none else* are eligible.' Here we see that the idea of Mr. Wesley's 'seminary for laborers' is scrupulously observed, and so far from its being regarded as an 'indispensable prerequisite' *before* being licensed to preach, or entering upon the work of the ministry, it is only the 'list of reserve,' the *excess of supply* over the *demand* for laborers, that are eligible, and '*none else*.' And hence provision is made that every year it shall be decided by a committee, which of the *young preachers* shall be sent to the institution, and which shall be kept on the 'list of reserve' for the immediate service of the home and foreign work; and it is also provided that they may be allowed to remain in the school for a longer or shorter time, as may be found consistent with the claims of the connection, for the immediate supply of the work with their services as *preachers*.

Now every feature of this establishment is in strict conformity with Methodism in every aspect, and it would meet with no opposition in any country among our people; but at the same time it has no resemblance to the 'theological seminaries,' as they exist in this country, nor does it at all conform to the views of the 'junior preacher' in his labored Essay.

Wherein does this transatlantic provision for the improvement of the junior preachers differ from the measures now in operation in most of the conferences of our Church? And if any of our conferences had a list of junior preachers in 'reserve,' for whom there was no field of labor, would not a similar course be marked out for them? And is not the 'course of study' for persons on trial for our itinerancy, virtually the same thing? And if any of our junior preachers, who apply unsuccessfully for admission into the itinerancy, because there are no circuits or stations, should go, as they ought to do, to any of our seminaries or colleges, for the improvement of their minds in literature and theology, would not the Church sustain them, and rejoice in it? But all this is regarded in this Essay as 'availing nothing,' so long as a theological education is not considered an '*indispensable prerequisite* for persons *entering* upon the duties of the Christian ministry.' For after distinctly admitting the provisions alluded to, he says, 'But *my inquiry is*, why no kind of study, either literary or theological, has ever been required, either in the Discipline or general usage of the Methodist Church, as a requisite for persons BEFORE they commence in the actual service of God's sanctuary?' Hence I repeat that the doctrines of this Essay are unmethodistical.

IV. But once more: we are told by this author, that Mr. Wesley was '*made a minister*, in the very *same way precisely* as the *education societies make ministers* at the present day.' And at the risk of the application of his epithet, 'fool hardiness,' I meet this statement by an unequivocal denial. It is a gross, and I had almost said an inexcusable mistake. My veneration for Mr. Wesley, and his hallowed memory, inspires a righteous indignation in my soul against such an imputation, which I hesitate not to say, if he were living, would be repelled with the tones of mild but firm remonstrance with which he resisted other heretical accusations: for heresy he would have regarded it. Indeed, I question whether either the education societies, or theological seminaries will be conciliated, if such was the author's expectation, by such a statement as this. Let us glance at it for a moment.

When was Mr. Wesley thus *made* a minister? Was it at the age of eight years, when he was admitted by his father to the sacrament? Or was it at Oxford, before or after he was ordained a deacon and priest? It must certainly have been before he sailed for America. And if so, do the 'education societies *make* ministers, in the same way *precisely*, at this day?' What kind of minister was he made? Let him answer.

'I went to America to convert the Indians, but O! who shall convert me? And now it is upward of two years since I left my native country, in order to teach the Georgia Indians the nature of Christianity; but what have I learned

myself, in the meantime? Why (what I least of all expected) that I who went to America to convert others was *never converted myself.*' What a strong testimony in favor of those ministers who are made *precisely in the same way* at this day! And speaking of other *such ministers*, he says, 'Are they read in *philosophy?* So was I. In *ancient or modern tongues?* So was I also. Are they versed in the *science of divinity?* I too have *studied it many years*, &c, &c. (See *Watson's Wesley.*)

Here we see what kind of a minister Mr. Wesley was made by his 'literary and theological training,' although he was all the while in the possession of the '*indispensable* prerequisite,' and thus far had been '*made* a minister precisely in the same way,' says the writer of the Essay, that the 'education societies *make* ministers at the present day.' I charitably hope this is also a mistake of the author, for these societies are dishonored by the imputation, no less than is Mr. Wesley.

The truth is, he was *made a minister by the Holy Ghost*, either simultaneously with his conversion, or immediately after it; for he was not a minister of Christ until then, in his own opinion, notwithstanding his 'training,' and his ordinations superadded. And Mr. Watson so regards him, for after relating Mr. Wesley's conversion, he says, 'From *this time* Mr. Wesley *commenced* his laborious and glorious ministry,' although no one can doubt that his varied learning was an invaluable advantage to him in his subsequent ministrations. Still it did not qualify him for the work, for he yet lacked that 'indispensable prerequisite,' which no seminary, either literary or theological, could furnish. While then it is true, that he was 'trained' for the regular ministry of the Church of England, and inducted into it, yet this was then but little else than a secular profession, like that of medicine, for he was trained at Oxford by a regular course of medicine, as well as divinity, and still he was not *made* a 'minister of Christ.' The qualification he deemed essential for this holy office was a Divine call, and it was accompanied by the tests in his own experience, which he afterward applied to others, viz. First, grace; Second, gifts; Third, fruits; and these only he taught to be the 'indispensable prerequisites.'

V. To show that this writer would depreciate the holy office of the ministry to the standard of mere secular callings, the following sentence is adduced from his Essay:—

'A man's being *moved* by a laudable desire to become a merchant certainly does not make him one; nor does an honest desire to become a mechanic, constitute any one a mechanic who indulges it; any more than a person's being *moved by the Holy Ghost to call sinners to repentance*, qualifies him, in every sense of the word, for the most successful performance of this work.'

Here then a comparison is instituted between the *motion* of a desire to be a merchant or mechanic, and being *moved* by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel. If this sentence means to recognize a Divine call to the ministry at all, it would leave us to infer, that he who is thus *moved*, is to understand himself to be called of God to preach, *not now*, but by and by, when he shall have acquired the 'indispensable prerequisite,' by a theological training. But if, as would seem more probable, he means that the Divine call, so named, is nothing more than a 'laudable desire,' or 'honest desire,' and that it is the same, whether to be a merchant, mechanic, or minister, a lawyer, or physician; then his whole scheme is not merely unmethodistical but anti-Christian. And that Church, however highly exalted in character and usefulness, however evangelical in doctrine or discipline, which shall enter into these 'views,' will be cursed with 'blasting and mildew,' and Ichabod may be written upon her altars.

VI. I object to this Essay, moreover, because of the injustice which is done to the Methodist Episcopal Church, and to her ministers. I say injustice, and in proof would refer to such questions as the following, 'Why has our Church *never made any provision* for qualifying such to preach the Gospel, as she believes the Holy Spirit calls to this work?' If the writer means his 'indispensable prerequisite,' by a 'theological seminary,' it is easy to answer his question, for the Church never regarded this as an essential qualification, much less the only one. But does he mean to say, that we have made *no provision* for qualifying those whom we believe *God has called* to this work? That he does, the following sentences from the Essay will show:—'Has the Methodist Church any usage or practice from which one might be led to infer that an *education* of any kind is indispensably necessary before one can be licensed as

a preacher of the Gospel? Nay, are not many of her usages the most directly calculated to give the impression that an *education is not necessary?* Do we not say in the constant practice of our quarterly and annual conferences, that if one has *gifts*, grace, and a sound understanding, it is enough?' And accordingly the Essay proceeds to affirm by the like interrogatories, that our Church '*often* say that one is qualified to go out in the awful and responsible office of a public teacher of Christian theology, when in fact he has *never read or studied one single book* on any subject embraced in the science which he is licensed to *teach* to others! Nay more: when he himself will tell you that he has indeed *never studied any thing* enough to acquire a knowledge of *the very first principles of his* VERNACULAR TONGUE!'

What a picture is here drawn of our Church and ministry by this 'junior preacher!' We marvel that he was not conscious of the gross injustice he has thus done to his own Church, and to his senior brethren. No intelligent member or friend of the Methodist Episcopal Church can fail to perceive, that she is cruelly 'wounded in the house of her friends!' That there are *Africans* in some of the slave states, and *Indians* in our missions, who have been licensed to preach, though they could not read even the Bible, is undoubtedly true, and the writer would scarcely be willing to question the propriety of such accommodation to emergencies, much less to assail the Church, because of these *rare* instances which are exceptions to the general rules. It is plain from his reference to 'our quarterly and annual conferences' that he had not these cases in his eye; but designed to convey the impression that it was done '*often*,' and even our '*constant practice!*' Such will be the inference legitimately drawn from this paragraph, by all who know no better.

Here then we take occasion to say, that this whole representation is as unjust as it is unkind, and that our 'usages' amply demonstrate, that an 'education is necessary,' and we deny that it is the 'constant practice of our quarterly and annual conferences,' or that we 'often say practically' that one is qualified to preach, who has 'never read or studied one single book,' or that has never 'acquired a knowledge of the *very first principles* of his vernacular tongue!' That some such men may be found in our ministry, is the fault of those who *administer our rules*, and not in the *rules themselves*.

I shall content myself here, by simply referring to the definition given in our book of Discipline to the term 'GIFTS,' as explained by Mr. Wesley himself, in his directions as to the 'indispensable prerequisites,' of those 'who *think* they are called of God to preach.' He says, inquire, 'Have they a *clear, sound understanding?* Have they a *right judgment in the things of God?* Have they a *just conception of salvation by faith?* And has God given them any degree of *utterance?* Do they speak *justly, readily, clearly?*' Now will the writer of the Essay pretend, that these 'gifts' will all appear in those who have 'never read a single book,' not even the Bible, nor acquired 'a knowledge of the *very first principles* of their vernacular tongue?' And yet these are the '*gifts*' by which we are to try every candidate for license to preach, if we are governed by our book of Discipline. And yet this Essay affirms that '*for all that any of our rules say to the contrary*,' our teachers of Christian theology may be thus utterly and hopelessly ignorant.

What means the requirement of our Discipline, that our preachers should 'spend all the morning, or at least five hours in twenty-four, in reading,' 'and to read the most useful books and that regularly and constantly?' What means the 'course of study' required by the conferences, according to his own admission, for persons on trial, after they have entered the ministry, and which the New-England conference and some others have adopted for candidates *before* they are admitted on trial? From the whole scope of this Essay, those who know no better are taught to believe, that the Methodist Episcopal Church are incapable of appreciating the importance of human learning, as subsidiary to usefulness in her ministers, than which nothing can be more remote from the truth. It is the mere cant and railing of our enemies that we, as a Church, depreciate or undervalue learning in our ministers, and those who have acquired the most exalted popularity every where, it is well known, have been those who have drank the most diligently at the fountains of knowledge and science. Some such, indeed many such, we have now, and have had from the beginning; and our people have not been slow in estimating their worth, and honoring them for their superiority. But with very few exceptions they were called of God to the ministry, and were not disobedient to the heavenly vision, but went forth to the work,

and by diligence and application they have cultivated learning, both secular and theological learning, while they have not ceased to labor in the vineyard, until they are 'workmen that need not be ashamed.' And such receive 'double honor,' and are every where esteemed very highly in love for their work's sake. That there are instances of gross idleness, and criminal ignorance too, in the ranks of the ministry, is freely admitted; but this is not to be ascribed to any lack of provision on the part of the Church, nor to any want of disposition among its members to promote and encourage learning. Such men would have been drones, however ample provision might have been made for their education by any Church.

It is true that Methodism, from the beginning, has denied the doctrine of this Essay, that a literary or theological education is an '*indispensable* prerequisite,' or an essential qualification in any aspect. This is apparent from the writings of Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, and Watson; and with equal pertinacity and uniformity in our own country, by Asbury, Cooper, Bangs, and Emory, all of whom have expressed themselves unequivocally upon this subject;—while at the same time all these writers agree in the importance of reading and study, and in the value of human learning, as a *secondary* qualification for usefulness, as an *auxiliary*, truly desirable in the work of the ministry, but by no means essential, much less indispensable to be acquired, *before* entering upon their duty.

A single fact will show the fallacy of this doctrine of the Essay, and it is this. There have been in every period of our history not a few, but multiplied instances of ministers, who, like John Newton, Francis Asbury, William Bramwell, Benjamin Abbott, Freeborn Garrettson, and a host of similar worthies, who have given full proof of their ministry, by a success approximating to that of the apostolic age. And though without his 'indispensable prerequisite,' they were called and qualified by the Holy Ghost, and while fulfilling their high commission, by entering the highways and hedges, proclaiming the unsearchable riches of Christ, they were 'trained' in his school, and *some of them* availed themselves of every possible means of improvement, and brought reason and revelation, art and science, heaven and earth, into requisition to contribute to their usefulness in the work. And of these it may be said, as of hundreds of evangelical men whom we have now in the field, that they entered the work *before* they had the opportunity of theological education, or ever saw a 'theological seminary,' and yet in no other college than a circuit, with no other library than could be carried in their saddlebags, they have become able ministers of the New Testament; and in point of character, talents, qualifications, and usefulness, will honorably compare with the same number of men sought and found by all the education societies in the land. We challenge the comparison, and await the issue.

Let no one then believe from this writer's Essay that our Church fosters ignorance in her ministry, or that we are unmindful of the value of learning. We are only strenuous in maintaining that human erudition shall not be regarded as a *primary* qualification, much less an *indispensable* one. And while we strenuously urge upon all our ministers habits of study, the cultivation of the sciences, and the acquisition of knowledge, yet we hold no fellowship with the doctrine, that when called of God to the work, they are to excuse themselves from immediate obedience, until they shall have gone through a three years' course of study in a 'theological seminary.' Much less can Methodism endure the sentiment, that young men are to be bred *for* the ministry, as for law or physic, or learn the *trade* of preaching, as that of a mechanic or merchant. The 'business,' as it is here styled, of 'calling sinners to repentance,' is one for which no man can be qualified by the appointment of men, or human learning, for 'none but He that made the world can make a minister;' and when he is so *made* by the infallible Head of the Church, let no man say that any indispensable prerequisite is lacking. If moved by the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, he will feel his obligation, 'as much as in him lies,' to seek every requisite and desirable qualification, and he will be admonished by our Discipline to 'read and study, or *quit the ministry*.' And such are every day demonstrating that there are other modes of 'literary and theological training,' quite as successful in qualifying for the labors of the sanctuary as that of the 'education societies and theological seminaries.'

'The great curse of the Church,' says the Rev. Dr. Bangs, 'has ever been the introducing of worldly-minded men into the ministry, who had no other qualification for their office, than *human erudition* and the *appointment of men*."* And

* See Note A at the end of the article.

while education societies are employed in 'finding out' and 'encouraging' persons to be *trained for* the ministry, it cannot be otherwise than that the Church will continue to suffer from this intrusion of unhallowed men into the sanctuary of God. It is true, that indigent *pious* young men are those usually selected; yet it will not be pretended, that *every pious young man* is called of God to the ministry, and indeed this Essay denies that even ardent piety is a qualification. Still, however, whatever qualification is absent, the '*indispensable prerequisite*' of a theological education must of course take the precedence of every other, for without it neither 'piety,' nor being 'moved of the Holy Ghost' to enter the ministry, is sufficient;—though a man have 'gifts, grace, and fruits,' yet still this Essay would exclaim, 'All this availeth nothing,' so long as the 'indispensable prerequisite' is wanting.

VII. There is one more sentiment advanced in this Essay, against which in the name of our common Christianity I would here enter my protest, and in behalf of Methodism especially record a disclaimer. It is in the allusion made to the necessity of accommodating ourselves to the day and age in which we live. The writer says, 'There is scarcely any perceptible similarity between the age in which we live now, and that in which Mr. Wesley lived; as little indeed as there is to be seen between *the manner of God's calling men into the ministry then*, and the *manner* of *His* doing this *now*.' Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur cum illis! Indeed! And is this true in any conceivable aspect? Did God call men into the ministry *then* in one way, and *now* in another? Did He in those days *dispense* with the '*indispensable prerequisite*,' and has He since given a new revelation to this junior preacher, cancelling that dispensation? Nay verily, 'God made man upright, and he has sought out many inventions;' and this is one of them. From the days of Christ until now, the call and qualification for the work of the ministry have been unchanged and unchangeable, and God forbid that the Methodist Episcopal Church should ever endure the 'heavenly-looking heresy,' which would imply the contrary. That Mr. Wesley, with his helpers and assistants, were called to do an extraordinary work, and that they were endued with extraordinary grace, is undeniable; but this was designed to 'put to nought the ignorance of foolish men,' who had already become 'wise above what was written.' This Essay affirms that 'the regular and ordinary ministers of Wesley's day were generally backslidden, or such as never possessed the life and power of godliness;' and thus presents us with all that was *extraordinary* in the case. The holy office had degenerated until 'human erudition and the appointment of men' were the only 'indispensable prerequisites;' and in signal refutation of this doctrine, Mr. Wesley and his preachers went forth in the name and strength of their Divine Master, and the most of them were like an equal proportion of the primitive apostles, for they too were recognized as 'unlearned and ignorant men,' and thus manifested that 'the excellency of the power is of God, and not of men.'

Let it not be supposed, however, that any of our first ministers could justly be denominated 'ignorant men;' for although unlearned in the scholastic divinity of the times, and without the classical attainments now deemed 'indispensable' by those who agree with the essayist; yet they had learned in the school of Christ, were called and qualified by His Spirit, and armed with the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God, they preached 'Jesus and the resurrection,' with demonstration from on high. Such have been many of their successors, who never had the opportunity, had they even desired it, of going through a 'literary or theological training,' and though they may be disowned by men, for lack of 'prerequisites' which they deem 'indispensable;' yet in the day of eternity hundreds and thousands of such ministers, with their seals, will be found among the redeemed, 'elect, chosen of God, and precious.'*

But while we protest against theological learning being made an '*indispensable prerequisite*' for the ministry of the Gospel, we are free to admit the high importance of sanctified learning, and would fain promote, by every possible means, the diligent and persevering acquisition of every species of useful science upon all those whom God calls to the work. But before we consent to educate men for the ministry, we must have satisfactory evidence that the great Head of the Church has designated them for His use; and evidences too, other than *youth*, *indigence*, *piety*, or *learning*. And when these evidences appear in those, who by youth, inexperience, or deficient education, are not wanted for the immediate

* See Note B at the end of the article.

supply of circuits and stations, we would rejoice in any provision for the cultivation of their minds, or the acquisition of knowledge. And such an institution, therefore, as the British Conference has organized for the instruction of junior preachers, would accomplish all that is desirable in the premises, and would be free from the cardinal objections to which this Essay and its sentiments are obnoxious. A theological education might thus be given to those whom God has made ministers, and the curse of introducing unhallowed men into the holy office would thus be obviated, as far as human foresight could prevent it. 'No man taketh this honor to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron,' Heb. v, 4.

These are the sentiments of Methodism distinctively; they have been such from the beginning, in both hemispheres; and for these and kindred opinions they have been, and still continue to be persecuted. But the author of this Essay has in our view abandoned the whole ground, and gone over fairly to the adversaries of Methodism, whether in or out of the Christian Church. The world of unbelievers agree in denouncing us as fanatics and enthusiasts, because our ministry profess to be 'inwardly moved of the Holy Ghost to take upon them the office of deacons or elders in the Church of God;' and this Essay maintains the sentiment, that though a man be thus *moved*, it no more qualifies him for his work, than a man being *moved* with a laudable desire to become a merchant or mechanic, constitutes him one. Thus far the author of the Essay unites with the infidel world in their opposition to Methodism.* But he goes over much more fully to the ground of hostility occupied by those Churches in our country who have been most strenuous in their crusade against our ministry and Church polity. These have over and again proclaimed to the world the 'illiteracy and incompetency' of Methodist 'circuit riders,' as men altogether destitute of the 'indispensable prerequisite' for which the author contends; and he confirms all that our enemies have said, in relation to the ignorance of our Church and the absence of all provision for the education of our preachers. Thus, we repeat it, he has formed a league with our enemies, unwittingly we hope, and therefore it is that this expostulation has been called forth, with the design of wresting from our foes the advantages they might otherwise take of the author's egregious mistakes.

And now, to prevent all possible misapprehension, I would frankly avow my full persuasion that many men, who have been as verily called of God to the ministry, as ever man was, have been educated and trained in 'theological seminaries,' and some such as are an honor to the sacred office; and it is admitted, moreover, that some of these have been called before their training and some after its completion, or during its progress. Nor do Methodists suppose for a moment, that a man is not called of God because he has been thus trained, or that a theological education would disqualify him for the work; but they expect from such the same evidences of a Divine call, which they require of others, viz. *gifts*, *grace*, and *fruits*, and they acknowledge no other '*indispensable* prerequisite.'

That there may be found individual members of our Church, who really think it a sin for a preacher to look into a dictionary, or English grammar, and who would lose all faith in a minister who used a Greek Testament, especially if he were college bred, we freely admit, and yet we can find such members of other Churches, and of those too who talk most about theological learning. But to infer from such instances a general dereliction, or charge universal stupidity upon the whole denomination, because of such examples, is as ungenerous as it is unjust, though 'if an enemy had done it, I could have borne it.'

The history of our Church ab origine, so far from being indifferent to learning, as we are here represented to be, has been a continued series of efforts to establish and promote education. And it would be easy to show that the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States has done much, and all that she could reasonably be expected to do under the circumstances, not only to promote institutions of learning, but to encourage the education of her ministers. It is true that we have no theological seminaries, where any young man, whom his parents have designated for the pulpit, or whose own caprice or interest, or inclination, may lead him there, can engage in the study of divinity, as of any other secular profession, with an assurance of a 'call,' or a 'living,' so soon as he shall acquire the 'indispensable prerequisite,' whether he has any other prerequisite or not; and God forbid we ever should have such an institution bearing the Methodist name.† Nor have we any 'education societies' for the purpose of '*finding out*

* See Note C at the end of the article. † See Note D at the end of the article.

young men, and encouraging them to *seek*' a training for the ministry; for we 'know our calling better,' and prefer that they should be 'thrust out' by the great Head of the Church, rather than that they should '*seek*' the 'priest's office for a piece of bread,' or be 'found out' by the appointment of men.

Our academies, colleges, and even our university, are now open, and the fountains of knowledge are unsealed among us as Methodists, in almost every part of this land. All our young men may now be educated, without having their morals endangered by corrupt and infidel teachers; and without having their Methodism ridiculed out of them, by professors or presidents. And already the revivals of religion with which these institutions of learning have been favored, give evidence of the Divine approbation upon this department of our work. Some of the pupils have already been designated by the Holy Ghost, and approved by the Church as ministers of the sanctuary, and the whole Church unite in glorifying God that He is hearing prayer, and sending more laborers into His vineyard. In His hands we leave the work of calling men to preach the Gospel; and whether He shall select them from the academy, college, or the university, or call them from their nets or tent making, as in ancient times, we have no fear that He will send them forth, without every prerequisite which is indispensable. Meanwhile, should any plan for the improvement of the junior preachers be instituted, resembling that of our British brethren, to which allusion has been made, there are many who would gladly embrace it, and profit by its advantages. We should doubt its expediency, however, from the fact, that so far from having any '*list of reserve*,' in most of our conferences many more laborers are wanted than can be procured, and hence very many circuits and missions remain unsupplied. Such is the want of men, called of God to preach the Gospel, that some hundreds of such would be employed in our work, and the indispensable prerequisite would be dispensed with, because we do not believe the impious sentiment, that 'God has decided that vacant churches and perishing sinners must *wait* until the *preparation* is made by *study*,' for calling men to repentance. And, moreover, if the time should arrive when any of our conferences have a surplus of preachers, not immediately needed, all our institutions of learning are open to them in common with others.

That some provision is needed in the Methodist Episcopal Church, for aiding such of our *young preachers* as may be desirours of cultivating their minds, and may be without the pecuniary means to supply themselves with necessary books, or to pay for tuition, may be freely admitted. But this would be improving and perfecting *our own plan* of ministerial education, and by no means conforming to the plans which other denominations have seen fit to adopt. This would be educating men IN the ministry, and not FOR the ministry; a distinction which, however others may regard, we, as Methodists, deem of vital and essential importance.

The name of '*theological seminary*' carries with it associations utterly repugnant to the feelings of our people, from the fact, that it is inseparable from the idea of '*men-made* ministers,' by which we mean, those who have no 'other qualification than the appointment of men, and human erudition,' a class with which we have no fellowship, and with whom we *love* to have none. And if in the Methodist Church a distinct organization should ever be formed, in which young men are to be placed for a 'theological training' to make them ministers, before the Church shall have acknowledged their call of God to this work, the glory will have departed from us as a people, and the purity of the sacred office, that high and holy calling, will be degenerated and degraded into a mere secular profession.

Hence it is, that if any one of our infant colleges were known to be *not purely literary*, or suspected of deteriorating into a *theological school*, it would be impossible to avert from it swift and certain destruction; for it would be utterly abandoned by the Church. I say not, that there are none in the Church who would not have it so, for this Essay gives evidence that there is one; but I hesitate not to affirm my conviction, that there are not enough of such in this whole country to found or support a 'theological seminary.' He who lives to see the experiment tried, will find it deserted and abandoned within one year from its birth, and a voice of general reprobation will be heard throughout 'the whole heaven and earth of Methodism.'

But let me ask the friends of the improvement of our junior preachers, and the advocates of an 'educated ministry,' and among all my acquaintance in the

Church, I number not one who is not; What need have we of this 'monster' being introduced among us? Have we not schools and seminaries of our own scattered all over the land? Have we not a number of colleges quite as great as the Church can hope to sustain at present, and a university superadded? And will not each of the latter have a professorship of moral science? And may not this chair be divided into different departments, if need be? May we not have a distinct professorship of Biblical criticism, intellectual and moral philosophy, sacred literature, and the institutes of divinity?* And will not all the objects proposed be thus secured to our young preachers who choose to go there; or might not an attendance upon such a course be made obligatory upon all candidates for the *itinerancy*, after they shall have given evidence to the Church of their call to the work, and been licensed to preach? And if societies are necessary to provide for the support and education of all such preachers as are in dependent circumstances, might they not be formed wherever necessary, and thus all the proposed advantages be secured, while the evils we deprecate would be averted? We aver that they can, unless there be a disposition to imitate 'the nations around us' to our own deterioration, and to abandon all our distinctive peculiarities. Let it not be supposed, however, that such an organization of a theological department in any of our colleges is called for, at the present, even under the restrictions here named. It is only *proposed* to those who are clamorous for 'theological seminaries,' and yet disclaim the designs imputed to them, whether all the objects they profess to aim at might not thus be attained, if indeed they intend no more than 'the improvement of our junior preachers.' If they still insist upon the innovations against which we protest, they convict themselves of other and ulterior purposes beside those which they are pleased to avow.

There are two grand divisions in sentiment among Protestant Churches, on the subject of ministerial qualification. One party believe that it is *lawful* to train young men *for* the ministry, who are designated by their friends for that office, or whose inclination, ambition, or interest, shall direct them to that profession, and *such* have theological seminaries. Another portion of the Christian Church deem it *unlawful* to educate any man *for* the ministry, whom the great Head of the Church has not obviously called to this holy work, and the Wesleyan Methodists all over the world are prominent in these views. The former of these grand divisions in the Protestant Churches believe and teach that a literary and theological education and training for the ministry is an 'indispensable prerequisite,' and, as some hold, the *only* one. The latter proclaim, and we are among them, that classical and theological learning, however valuable as subsidiary or secondary qualifications, are not 'indispensable,' nor *comparable in importance*, with personal piety, aptness to teach, and the love of souls: and that even with all these, there must be satisfactory evidence of a Divine call to this work, before any education society or Church can *lawfully* prepare men *for* the ministry, either in a theological seminary or elsewhere. On this side of the controversy, Methodism has been arrayed ab origine, and will continue to occupy this ground, until the 'consummation of all things;' unless Methodism itself should be sooner annihilated by abandoning the great principles involved in this question, and consenting to be cursed with a worldly and unhallowed ministry. And should not our Church 'know our calling better,' than to institute in any period of her history such a theological seminary; this result will infallibly follow. For it is clearly implied in such an institution, that the business of preaching the Gospel is there taught, and who shall forbid access to its portals, to any man who chooses to learn, and pays for his instruction? Whatever the motives of the applicant for admission, he has an undoubted right to study divinity in such a school, precisely as he would have to enter a school of medicine or law. And as the latter class of seminaries hold out to the applicant the dispensation of authority, and qualification to practise either of the learned professions they teach, at the termination of his studies, so does the theological school imply the assurance of every necessary authority and qualification for the ministry, to all its students. And as the diploma of a medical college is necessary for the physician to be reputable among his compeers, and that of the law school is required for respectability in that profession; so also will the testimonials of the theological seminary be the indispensable prerequisites, and perhaps become the only ones to a standing in the ministry. Such, it is obvious, will be the results of

* See Note E at the end of the article.

the proposed system, as certainly as 'like causes produce like effects,' and it is impossible to separate the one from the other.

Such are the considerations that have impelled me to this remonstrance and expostulation, against what I deem a dangerous and ruinous innovation into the Church of my choice, and a Church which I desire may become the praise of the whole earth, for purity of doctrine, and for an evangelical ministry. If my zeal has led me into any indiscreet or unguarded expression, I ask pardon of God and man; but in the subject matter of the present communication, I am strictly conscientious, and duty to the cause of God and his Church will, I trust, ever predominate over every selfish consideration. I have consciously impugned no man's motives, who may honestly differ from me in opinion, nor will I value him less because of the fearless expression of that opinion. But believing, as I do, that the sentiments of the Essay upon which I have animadverted, are radically erroneous, and calculated to sap the foundations of the ecclesiastical edifice which I so highly prize, I can make no compromise with my conscience. but by contributing this humble effort, in vindication of truth as contradistinguished from error, on this important subject. That the glory of God, the purity of the Church, and the improvement of our ministry, may be promoted thereby, is my humble prayer.

NOTES BY THE EDITOR.

Note A, page 112.

The author of the above quotation says the same still. But may not an *ignorant* man be as worldly minded as a *learned* man? This writer certainly does not suppose that all illiterate men who enter the ministry are therefore called of God to that work? The curse is supposed to rest upon those who depend upon their learning *only*, and the mere appointment of men, and not because they *are* learned. As there may be learned dolts, and learned men destitute of the spiritual qualifications which the Scriptures require of all true ministers, so there may be unlettered dolts, ignorant men destitute of the Spirit of God. May He save the Church from both the one and the other.

What we insist upon is, that, whether learned or unlearned, a man must be a holy man, and be called especially by the Holy Spirit to the work, in order to be a true minister of Jesus Christ.

Note B, page 113.

No one ever doubted this, and hence it is a waste of time to attempt to prove it. But we believe with our Church, that whenever God calls a man to preach the Gospel, whether learned or unlearned, He calls him with an equally loud and authoritative voice to 'study to show himself approved unto God,' that he may acquire all the knowledge within his reach, for a right understanding and faithful discharge of his duty. If this be so, then it follows, that a minister, though called of God, who neglects this duty, forfeits the high honor intended for him, and the 'one talent' is taken from him, and 'given to him that hath ten talents.'

Note C, page 114.

We cannot help entering our disclaimer at this assertion. Neither Mr. Sunderland nor any other Methodist preacher that we ever heard of, derides as fanaticism the idea of a man's being called of God to preach the Gospel. See our sentiments on this subject in the preliminary remarks to these strictures.

Note D, page 114.

In this we cordially unite with our author. But he should have first shown that any one ever wanted a seminary to educate such persons for the ministry.

We consider all these remarks about educating improper persons for this work wholly gratuitous, as entirely inapplicable, because no one ever plead for such an education for *such* persons.

Note E, page 116.

Compare this with the expressions, 'If our infant institutions were suspected of degenerating into *theological schools*, it would be impossible to avert from them swift and certain destruction;' and yet here the author recommends the very thing he so feelingly deprecates! For surely a 'chair for Biblical criticism, sacred literature, and the institutes of divinity,' would be a divinity chair to all intents and purposes. And would there be no danger that unsuitable young men, not called by the Holy Spirit, should come under the influence of such a chair, equally as much as if it were a theological chair placed in another room!

REYNOLDS ON THE USE OF THE EYES.

Hints to Students on the Use of the Eyes. By Edward Reynolds, M. D., of Boston.—[*Biblical Repertory, for July*, 1833.]

The eye is a little world of wonders, whether we consider its structure, or its movements, or the noble offices it performs. In the beautiful language of the Savior, it is 'the light of the body.' It watches over its members, it directs its movements, it warns it of danger. But it has higher offices. It is the messenger of the mind, sent forth to collect the materials of thought. In the words of the Essay before us, 'Its importance rises in value when it is considered as the channel of most of the knowledge of nature, and through her, of the wisdom, majesty, and goodness of God.' But it is also the interpreter of the soul, and expresses its inmost feelings, its most delicate shades of emotion, with a faithfulness and power, which the pen and the tongue can never rival, although they boast of 'words that burn.'

And yet this noble organ, which gives to the mind most of its knowledge of the world below, and furnishes the most beautiful imagery to shadow forth the glories of that which is above, is wretchedly neglected, and often shamefully abused. Great pains are taken to educate the limbs to move with grace and effect; the tongue is trained with great care to articulate every letter, and combination of letters; but the eye is left to educate itself; and if it selects the most important and beautiful objects, or examines them in the best manner, or is used with skill or prudence, it is the result of accident, and not of instruction or training.

But our immediate concern is with the question, how instruments of such value and delicacy shall be used, so as to secure them from disease and premature decay. We consider the student and the clergyman not a little indebted to the editor of the 'Biblical Repertory,' and his able correspondent, for presenting, in this form, a set of maxims and precepts which, if observed, would save many an hour of suffering and idleness; and we are anxious to bring them to the notice of parents and teachers.

We must reluctantly pass over, without a remark, the beautiful introduction of Dr. Reynolds, in order to preserve all our space for the practical portion of his essay, with a single reference to his observations on the ten-fold power and value which the art of printing has conferred on the eye. The mental treasures of ages are thus brought within its reach; it can discern, through these characters, not only the aspect of distant countries, but the events of past ages, and discover the hidden wonders of the unseen and future world in the pages of inspiration.

In commencing his remarks on the management of the eyes, Dr. R. observes, that this is emphatically '*the reading age*,' and states this fact in terms which may suggest other ideas than those which relate to vision.

'Reading is the fashion of the day. It commences with the child in the

nursery; constitutes the chief business of boyhood and youth; and continues through manhood and old age. No period is considered too tender for this all-important business of education to be commenced. No threatening evils are of sufficient moment to stand in its way; no acquirements sufficiently great to permit repose. As one advances in his course, new demands for exertion present themselves; new temptations multiply; new sources of information are thrown open to him. His eyes begin to manifest the alarming signs of inordinate use; but they are too often disregarded, until incurable disease numbers him among its victims;—and he learns, when too late, that he has closed the widest door of knowledge to the soul, and is left to mourn, with many a kindred spirit, the premature sacrifice of his usefulness and power.'

In connection with this, Dr. R. informs us that the present age is marked by 'an unusual prevalence of diseases of the eye,' and that among the ablest and most valuable of our clergy, and public officers, and literary men. He maintains, however, that this is by no means a necessary consequence of a studious life; and appeals to the history of students who have used their eyes to an extent scarcely credible, and yet preserved their vision unimpaired to advanced old age. He describes the wonderful provision which the Creator has made for the safety of these precious organs; and assures us, that the source of its diseases are to be found, not in their use, but in their abuse,—in the ignorance which knows not, or the negligence which regards not, the laws by which the most exquisite of optical instruments should be regulated. His first object, therefore, is to give the student (for whose benefit he principally writes) some correct ideas of the degree, and proper adjustment of the light, by which he studies.

The first circumstance he mentions, as 'one of the most prolific causes of weakness of sight,'—which has caused the destruction of many eyes, is little suspected, because the injury is generally gradual,—'*the exposure of the eyes to frequent alternations of weak and strong light.*' The immediate sensation of pain, when a strong light is brought into a dark room, should be a sufficient warning. The ultimate effects are like those of sudden changes from heat to cold upon the body; and when the light has been long excluded, the tyrant Dionysius, the Carthaginians in their punishment of Regulus, and even the liberators of long-immured prisoners, have found the sudden transition to the brilliancy of day sufficient to produce total blindness.

In most parts of the earth the general course of nature is adapted to the structure of the eye; and the brilliant sun is ushered in by a gradually-increasing twilight. But we neglect, or counteract this indication of nature. Many exclude all light from the sleeping room, until it is ready to burst upon them in its strength. The darkest room is often selected for the study, and the evening lights are not introduced until total darkness has rendered the eye peculiarly susceptible. In illustration of the danger of these practices, Dr. R. mentions the case of a lawyer who brought on a serious disease by performing his studies and labors in a gloomy room, and passing into one of brilliant light to take his meals. But a more serious warning is found in the case of a young traveller, who was awakened in the morning by the rays of the sun shining in upon him; and on exposing himself a second day in the same chamber, was seized with a violent opthalmia, which produced a course of weakness and suffering for years.

The first and most obvious rule which Dr. R. derives from these facts is, that we should not expose the eyes suddenly to a strong light upon awaking from sleep. To avoid this, he would advise a western room for sleeping; and where that cannot be obtained, he directs us to produce the same effect by curtains or blinds, which will soften the light, so as to render it agreeable to the eyes.

The succeeding rules are not less obvious inferences from these facts—that the room selected for the study should be *well lighted*, both in the day and evening, and the eyes should not be unfitted for their evening task by the popular mode of resting them for an hour or more in darkness. Of this last habit, he observes, there can be 'no more certain mode of inducing the evils from sudden changes of light.' The light should always be regulated according to the powers of the eye; and it is equally important that the amount and distribution of it should be such as to produce no unpleasant sensations.

Reflected and concentrated light are highly injurious. Two cases of actual blindness have occurred within the knowledge of Dr. R. in a few years, from exposure to concentrated light; and weakness of sight that has unfitted the individual for usefulness through life has often been the consequence of it. The rays of the sun he considers peculiarly injurious, when reflected from an opposite

building or wall, or even when they enter through a window descending to the floor, and are thence reflected to the eyes. Any exposure of this kind should be obviated by curtains of some soft color, and the furniture should be such as the eye may repose upon with agreeable sensations. Nature is clothed with drapery whose color is refreshing to the eye; and it is false taste, as well as false philosophy, which attempts to dazzle, in order to please it.

Fatal mistakes, Dr. R. remarks, are often made, and we may add, no less fatal economy is often practised, in regard to *the quantity of light suitable for evening study.* Many think they are performing an important service to the eyes, by accustoming them to little light, when, in his view, nothing can be more injurious. 'The irregular, flickering light of common lamps and candles' he regards 'as the worst possible means of lighting the study.' Candles, if used at all, should be of wax or spermaceti; but he prefers the common Argand study lamp, (the lamp with a circular wick, which still bears the name of the inventor,) furnished with a shade of oiled paper, which diffuses sufficient light without any offensive glare, and is free from the objections of concentrated light, produced by the dark shade, or the less objectionable one of ground glass.

In connection with this part of the subject, Dr. R. notices several habits of studious men which are injurious. *Shades over the eyes* he considers injurious to all, except those individuals whose eyes are prominent, and stand out far from the head, and whose eye-brows and eye-lashes are weak and insufficient. Such as are deprived of nature's shades, require some substitute; but this should be of thin, green silk, which will soften, but not exclude the rays of light.

The habit of saving time by reading and writing by twilight or moonlight he protests against as miserable economy, which has prematurely ruined the eyes of hundreds and thousands, and robbed religion and learning of many an able friend.

He also cautions us against gazing at the moon for a long time, as a dangerous habit, or watching the flashes of lightning. The pupil, dilated by surrounding darkness, permits this highly-concentrated light to pass to the eyes in too great quantities; and the history of astronomy points to a number of its votaries who were blinded by this habit.

Reading and writing by a side light is a practice by which many have ignorantly or thoughtlessly impaired their vision. At first view this would seem too trivial a circumstance to produce the least effect; and yet it only requires the glimpse at the structure and physiology of the eye which Dr. R. gives us, to see that it is of material importance. The iris, or colored portion of the eye, which gives it its beauty, serves also as a curtain to protect it, and instinctively opens, when the light is diminished, and contracts when it is increased. This transition, which is easily observed by looking at the eyes in a glass after they have been kept in darkness for a few moments, renders the sudden change of light injurious, and also makes it important, that *both eyes should be exposed to an equal degree of light.* The sympathy between the eyes, Dr. R. informs us, is so great, that if the pupil of one is dilated by being kept in the shade, as must, of course, be the case, where the light is on one side, the eye which is exposed cannot contract itself sufficiently for protection, and the exposed eye is almost inevitably injured.

On the same general principles, the habit of sitting in front of a window, with the back toward it, and holding the book or paper before the eyes, or of holding a candle between the eyes and the book, for the purpose of seeing more distinctly, is very injurious. Those, however, whose eyes fail from age, are in danger of falling into this habit; and to such Dr. R. advises an immediate recourse to spectacles.

In reply to the question, 'What is the direction best suited to the eyes?' Dr. R. replies,—'*It is that light which is sufficient for distinct vision, and which falls over the left shoulder in an oblique direction, from above, upon the book or study table.*'

The last direction which is given on this point is, that the eye should be protected in the summer from the direct rays of the burning sun, by making the rim of the hat of sufficient width. '*Eye destroyers,*' he observes, 'would not be an inappropriate name for the narrow things, which, by some of the more recent fashions, are called hats.'

Such is an imperfect and partial sketch of an Essay of peculiar interest and value. We design to complete the review hereafter; but we trust that enough has already been stated to rouse the attention of parents and teachers, as well as students, to this important subject, and to show them the practical value of a knowledge of physiology.



REV. HENRY WARE.

THE

METHODIST MAGAZINE,

AND

Quarterly Review.

Vol. XVII, No. 2. APRIL, 1835. New Series—Vol. VI, No. 2.

PRESIDENT RUTER'S BACCALAUREATE ADDRESS,

To the Graduates and Students of Allegheny College.

Young Gentlemen,—It is with feelings of lively interest that I improve the opportunity now afforded, for the purpose of offering you some advice, upon subjects which may be expected, in future, to claim your attention.

You have arrived at that period in your literary progress, which many circumstances render important, and which seems to promise a rich reward to your industry. To this period you have been directing your views, with agreeable anticipation, considering it as one that must hold a distinguished place among the most interesting seasons of your lives. But while it is rendered joyful, from the consideration of your success, and the honors conferred upon you, it is also distinguished by being the time of your separation. Your pupilage now closes, and you part, each from the other, and from your instructors, it may be to meet no more upon earth. Leaving the halls of learning, and the grounds consecrated to scientific improvement, you enter upon the busy scenes of a transitory life, not knowing what joys or sorrows await you in your career, what may be your success in life, or your prospects in the hour of dissolution.

While pursuing the various branches of learning included in your course, as well as in your earlier studies, you have found that science is too valuable a treasure to be acquired without labor, and that those who will possess it must exercise energy and perseverance. But amidst the toils of investigation, while advancing from one step to another still higher in the path of useful knowledge, you have kept in mind the value of the object, viewing it as a rich possession, which, being once acquired, can never be wrested from you. Encouraged by this consideration, and cheered with the prospects of success, you have completed the work assigned you in this institution, and received the customary honors.

But though your pupilage now closes, and you enjoy the approbation of your instructors, as having made honorable proficiency, and as possessing respectable acquirements, you surely do not consider your education as finished. So far from this, it can only be said that you are now prepared to cultivate the sciences by your own skill, without the aid you have been accustomed to receive from others. The treasures of learning have been spread out before you, and while experiencing their difficulties, and tasting some of their sweets, you must have perceived that there is an immensity in their resources. Were you now to

cherish an opinion which seems to have influenced too many others, that, after leaving college, there is little need, and scarcely any room for farther improvement, you would disappoint your friends, injure yourselves, and fail of being extensively useful to society. You may with such an opinion enjoy the brief honor of having had a liberal education, but can never hold a distinguished rank as scholars.

That great improvements may be made in time of youth, is not doubted; but this furnishes no evidence that all our acquirements should be obtained in that season of life. It is admitted that in early life our time should be chiefly employed in the acquisition of useful knowledge. This is a fact of the utmost importance. The foundation for literary honors and eminent usefulness must be laid in the morning of our days. Without a good foundation seasonably laid, the superstructure of a thorough education can never be built. But it is equally certain, that the foundation may be laid, and the superstructure afterward neglected. And it is to be regretted that this frequently happens. Many a youth of promising talents, instead of rising to usefulness and honor, has merely attained a scanty mediocrity, or perhaps sunk into ruins amidst indolence and dissipation.

Genius alone, talents unimproved, can never raise one to eminence. No one was ever born a scholar; nor is it possible to become one without mental discipline. Where this is wanting, genuine scholarship is never found. But by the aid of this, some of the most discouraging obstacles have been overcome; and minds that seemed in their early studies incapable of advancing, have ultimately reached the highest attainments. Those that have astonished mankind by their gigantic powers, and rendered their names immortal by scientific researches, have accomplished their work, not so much by superiority of natural talents, as by patient attention and persevering industry. Hence it is of the utmost importance, that those who graduate from our colleges should be impressed with the necessity of making continual additions to their qualifications for usefulness.

Nor is it sufficient that the votaries of learning should be constantly adding to their own acquirements, but they ought to aim at improving the arts and sciences themselves. Shall we be told, that after so many improvements no room remains for any others? This, we may presume, was the cry of the indolent prior to the days of Bacon, Locke, Newton, Herschel, and others, to whose industry and skill the world has been so much indebted. It will ever be the cry of all such as wish to shun the toil of investigation; but it will never be true. Rivers may dry up, fountains may fail, but the sources of useful knowledge can never be exhausted. The progress already made, far from furnishing evidence that no more is practicable, affords the best encouragement to the adventurer in the arts, to the searcher after truth, to the lover of learning. Let this be well fixed in the mind of every student, every graduate, every scholar. Let each be resolved on a life of activity and usefulness. Let the allurements of fashionable romance and light reading be manfully resisted. Let sound, classical, mathematical, and philosophical learning be the theme; and who shall be able to estimate the result? Might we not expect to see light and knowledge extending to every land, the arts and sciences in their glory, and their enterprising sons rising up to eclipse the literary giants of former centuries?

But if you would be successful in acquiring useful knowledge and literary distinction, it will be necessary, not only that you should be industrious and persevering in your studies, but likewise that you pursue a habit of regular thinking; that is, a certain discipline of thought, by which you may be able to direct your own attention to subjects of investigation. This habit you have in some degree already attained. Your studies in the languages, in mathematics, and in the philosophy of the mind, have assisted in forming it. But unless a correct method has been kept in your view as a leading object, it is presumable that in this you may yet make some improvement. In all the pursuits of life, much advantage may be derived from this kind of self government, and in scientific investigations nothing valuable can be accomplished without it. Attention and a habit of close thinking are indispensable to such as would excel in any branch of profound learning.

In departing from this institution, and engaging in the active concerns of life, beside cultivating the arts and sciences, and improving your own minds, there is another object of interesting character, which we may hope will share your attention and your influence. It is that of improving the minds of others. We desire that all who graduate, and indeed all that receive any part of their literary acquirements at this college, may go from us, carrying with them a proper view of this subject, and fully impressed with the importance of increasing and extending the means of education.

The diffusion of useful knowledge is essential to the well being of society, and indispensable to the preservation of a republican government. Monarchy may be extended and sustained over a population of ignorant peasantry, sunk into a state of the lowest degradation and slavery. Aristocracy may have a luxuriant growth in a land of darkness and superstition. And where no regular government has gained an ascendency, an uncultivated people may live in anarchy. But it is only in the land of light and learning, of virtue and religion, that liberty and free government can find an asylum. The seed may be planted in other lands, it may sprout and grow for a season, but if the people are destitute of moral culture, it will wither, decay, and fall to the ground. Our own happy government is based upon the virtue and intelligence of the people. Let the people be enlightened, let learning and intelligence be cultivated among all classes, in proportion to their wants and the increase of population, and our rights will remain unimpaired. But should vice gain a preponderating influence, and corruption prevail in our councils, our government would be ruined, and the nation undone.

The cultivation of the human mind, by judicious instruction and discipline, has been deemed among all enlightened nations a very important object. In some of the most celebrated governments of the ancients, it was made a part of their civil institutions. The Hebrews, Persians, and Grecians, were all distinguished by their zeal in providing schools of learning. Christianity from its first establishment has ever been favorable to the moral culture of the human race, by the diffusion of learning in conjunction with its own Divine principles.—When true religion revived in Europe in the sixteenth century, there was a simultaneous increase of literature. The education of youth became an object of general interest, and seminaries of learning, in all their varieties then known, were established in the principal kingdoms.

At a more recent date, the spirit of improvement, both in the establishment of seminaries, and in the mode of instruction, has been reviving, both in Europe and America, with a zeal unknown in any former age. A taste for the sciences is increasing, the advantages to be derived from them are more fully appreciated, and much interest is felt in behalf of the rising generation. Though this interest is far from being sufficiently extended, and multitudes are indifferent, we trust the time will come when it will be cherished in some degree by every citizen. And while we desire to see our whole population taking an active part in promoting the interests of learning, we expect such as possess the advantages of an extensive education will use their utmost influence in so important a cause. We hope they will diffuse the light of science, encourage investigation, and make it a part of their business through life, to assist in the great work of releasing the human mind from the chains of ignorance and depravity.

Among the means employed for the early improvement of the human mind, and the advancement of education, the establishment of infant schools has recently become an object of attention, and promises usefulness. The design of these schools is, to make early and favorable impressions upon the infant minds of both sexes, to aid them in thinking, in acquiring habits of correct speaking, and to instruct them in the rudiments of learning. No part of education is more important than that which gives the first bias to the young mind; and whether given by a parent, guardian, or instructor, it is of great importance that it should be of a proper character, and imparted in a suitable manner.—The art of communicating instruction has never been sufficiently cultivated, nor appreciated. It is the most important of all arts; yet has it been frequently entrusted to those, who, in reference to character, taste, acquirements, and habits, were most unfit for the duty. To polish the marble requires skill in the artist, to polish the diamond requires additional skill; but to polish the human mind, the utmost efforts of superior skill should be employed.

The powers of the mind render it capable of early improvement. In their plays and amusements, children are found engaged in counting and making calculations; and we are often surprised at the readiness of their conceptions, the aptitude of their remarks, and the distinctness of their recollections. It is in these early seasons that durable impressions, of a suitable kind, should be made.

If early education be neglected, the consequence is not merely a loss of time that might have been spent in learning, nor is it the mischief, only, of remaining in ignorance. Those that are thus neglected will acquire habits of idleness and vice, which are often unconquerable in their nature and ruinous in their effects. Nothing is more advantageous to young minds, than employment and exercise; of such a nature, also, as will be pleasing, profitable, and calculated to fix upon them habits of improving their time. Though parents and guardians who are skilful in giving instructions may do much for those entrusted to their care, nothing can supply the advantages of a well-regulated school, under the management of a qualified instructor.

Under the denomination of common English schools, we comprehend the most numerous class of seminaries in the United States.—And as these are intended to diffuse learning among a greater number

than any other class of schools, they merit a support and patronage equal to their importance. Eighty thousand of these schools, exclusive of our numerous and valuable Sabbath schools, would scarcely be sufficient to supply the youth of our nation; yet they fall far short of that number. With the exception of the northern states, which have an excellent establishment of schools, our country presents a general deficiency. The merchant is industrious to accomplish an enterprise, the mechanic, to improve his production, and the planter, to cultivate his lands; but schools have been neglected, and the cultivation of the mind is often viewed as unnecessary, or as a secondary object. This neglect of moral improvement, fraught with so much loss to the individual sufferers, so much mischief to the community, and which is in itself so ruinous to civil institutions, seems to require the prompt and effectual interference of the legislature of every state where such deficiency exists. In our own state a system has been recently adopted, which promises much good to the community, and cannot fail of receiving the blessing of Heaven.

Nothing is wanting to render the cause of education successful, and to secure the prosperity of our colleges and academies, but a sufficient number of those schools, in which both sexes may acquire a thorough English education. The number of pupils would be increased, a thirst for the higher branches of learning would be created, and academic institutions would have extensive patronage. Where academies are rendered prosperous, collegiate education will be duly estimated, and literary institutions of the highest gradation will be encouraged.

In Europe, though there is a great deficiency of instruction among the peasantry, colleges and universities are numerous, richly endowed, and generally well attended. The oldest are those at Oxford, Cambridge, Paris, Salamanca, and Bologna. In the United States, also, they are numerous, though many of them are deficient in their endowments. With the growth of the country we may expect they will advance, both in their resources and facilities for instruction, until they shall vie with the best institutions of the eastern continent. The connection of manual labor with collegiate studies is believed to be a valuable improvement, favorable to health, and calculated greatly to increase the means of acquiring extensive learning.

But amidst the great work of diffusing the light of science, some attention is due to the mode of instruction. We see numerous improvements in other things, and it would seem discouraging indeed if none could be made in the art of cultivating the mental faculties. In surveying the powers of the mind, we perceive the desire of esteem, of power, and of knowledge, almost universal. This last desire is conspicuous even in children, nor does it usually forsake them in riper years. Novelty is considered as one great source of the pleasures of taste, without which other pleasures often lose their relish. That there may be some that do not desire learning, but seem to love ignorance for its own sake, is not denied. But we think these cases may be attributed to other causes than that of an original aversion to knowledge. We have, nevertheless, the fact before us, that while the desire of knowledge is very general, many young minds manifest an aversion to seminaries of instruction. Is not this attributable to a deficiency in the methods of teaching, or in the character of the teacher? Many

have ample literary acquirements, and yet are incapable of instructing. Like gold buried in the earth, their learning is inaccessible, their efforts to impart it to others are unavailing. Teachers not understanding the philosophy of the human mind, have thought it necessary to put on airs of sternness and austerity, lest they should not be respected.—Hence, in many instances, students have been led to look upon their instructors as tyrants, upon their studies as slavish, and upon seminaries of learning as little else than prisons. But as it never was the design of religion, so neither was it of learning, to assume a monkish sourness, and repulsive austerity of manners. If these must exist among human beings, the convent surely is the proper place for them. There let lazy ignorance and gloomy superstition fix their eternal dwelling; but let seminaries of learning be places of social and rational exercise, such as are favorable to intellectual improvement.

The grand design of education comprehends the branches of physical, intellectual, and moral. It embraces whatever is proper for the health, strength, and growth of the body, and for storing the mind with sound learning, good taste, and moral principles. All these are indispensable to a good education, and the omission of any one of them would render it very defective. The physical part requires plentiful exercise, either by manual labor or otherwise, and regular habits in diet, sleep, and study. The intellectual part requires effort and industry, both on the part of the teacher and student, but is never difficult, when the taste and inclination, as they ever ought to be, are on the side of improvement. And if our views were confined to the present life, without reference to the future, even then moral principle would be indispensable. Without it, civil government could not be sustained, the most sacred obligations would be violated, individual rights would cease to be regarded, and anarchy would gain the ascendency. We may indeed talk loudly of the dignity and perfection of human nature; we may sound the praises of reason and philosophy; but without the checks of moral and religious influence, all our valuable institutions must sink into ruin and desolation. But if moral principle is essential in view of the present life only, how much more so in prospect of an eternal existence. The soul of man, like his body, has its infancy.—Its facilities expand slowly, or rapidly, in proportion, not so much to the growth of the body, as to its privileges, opportunities, and industry. And although the body may reach in a certain time its utmost limits, we know of no established limits to the growth of the soul.—No boundaries are affixed to our progress in knowledge and piety in the present state, and we have strong evidence that none will exist in the state that is before us. In prospect, then, of usefulness and happiness in this life, and of an eternal existence hereafter, let this last and most important requisite of a good education be kept in view.

But beside promoting the cause of education by encouraging schools, academies, and colleges, there are other means of improvement meriting our notice, which may be rendered useful, not only to the rising generation, but to all classes of our citizens. The encouragement of general reading, by the establishment of libraries in our towns and villages, and in the populous parts of the country, would secure great advantages at a small expense. And it is desirable that students, in leaving the college, should be sensible of their importance in the great

work of moral and mental cultivation. The illustrious Franklin was instrumental in the formation of a library in his adopted city, which is now one of the largest and most valuable in the United States. Let those who know the value of useful knowledge, and such as feel the want of it, follow his example. If they cannot make large collections, and form libraries containing thousands of volumes, let them gather hundreds; and where this cannot be effected, let general reading be encouraged by the circulation of tracts and periodicals. At any expense, and by all rational means, let instruction be imparted, and useful knowledge diffused throughout every land.

Thus, gentlemen, an extensive field of usefulness is open before you, abounding in the fairest prospects, and affording the richest entertainments of intellectual delight. Nor is it suitable that you should enjoy this feast in solitude, while you behold the means for gathering multitudes of all classes of the community, and of both sexes, particularly the youth, to share it with you. And so rich are the stores of learning, that no increase of her votaries can ever exhaust her treasures. The sun of science, like the sun in the heavens, may shine on millions of others, without lessening his benign influence upon us. And though millions should emerge from the glooms of ignorance and degradation to the most exalted attainments, far from diminishing, it could but increase the satisfaction of every intelligent spectator. Nor can we doubt that the days of darkness and ignorance are passing away, to be succeeded by a glorious dawn upon the most benighted countries.—The arts and sciences are the handmaids of the Gospel, under whose glorious dispensation we now live. And while that is flying with the wings of the morning to every nation, diffusing its heavenly influence among men, they will follow it, and be in all places its ready attendants.

Go, then, to your places of destination, with firmness of purpose; cultivate useful knowledge in your own minds, cherish it in the minds of others. Encourage the establishment of schools, libraries, and literary societies; remembering, at all times and places, that to assist in raising the human mind from its degradation, in diffusing learning and religion, and promoting the well being of society, will secure the great objects of the present life, and cannot fail of receiving the approbation of Heaven.

But in addressing you, as I now do, at one of the most momentous periods of your existence, I cannot close without urging more fully and specifically the importance of experimental and practical piety.—With the learned and the unlearned, with the rich and the poor, in prosperity and adversity, in life and in death, this is the most valuable of all treasures. Without this treasure, learning itself can never qualify you for happiness. With it, all other blessings will appear in their fairest characters. This is the Divine principle that raises fallen man from a state of ruin, and restores him to the image of his Maker. This directs his steps from the frowns of guilt and condemnation, to the smiles of Divine favor, and fits him for the society of angels.

Pedantry and superficial philosophy may tell you that this subject is doubtful, and ought to be approached with caution. The idle, half-instructed skeptic may endeavor to discourage you by crying 'mystery,' and alleging that a cloud hovers over us, limiting our views, and com-

pelling us to remain in uncertainty. But profound learning, sound erudition, pierces this cloud and dispels the gloom; presenting to us the sure word of prophecy, supported by authentic evidence, giving us the promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come. In this sacred word, we find a complete system of morals, the doctrines of evangelical truth, and a compendium of the sciences. Here is exhibited the true foundation upon which is built the glorious superstructure of Christianity, extending from earth to heaven; by means of which hundreds of millions will escape the snares of death, and gain eternal blessedness.

And if the enemies of the cross tempt you to the opposite course, urging you to the pursuit of vain pleasures, to the stupid and ruinous amusements of gaming and dissipation, let them not prevail. They have the passions and appetites enlisted on their side, but we have reason and revelation on ours. And when the cup of infidelity is presented to your lips, we trust you will be able to refuse the poisonous draught, and to meet with firmness all such as offer it. Do they talk of philosophy? Recollect that the greatest among all the philosophers was a devoted Christian. Yes, the great Newton was a Christian. Follow him and his associates in learning, but follow them likewise in true religion. While with Newton you measure the heavens, and the orbs which decorate them; while with Boyle you examine the regions of organic nature; with Bacon deduce from individual facts the laws of the material world; with Herschel mount to the firmament, and learn the wonders of astronomy from the heavenly bodies themselves; or with Locke explore the mysterious powers and operations of the mind; with these same illustrious authors, go from nature to nature's God. Read His Divine character in the book of nature; read it in the book of revelation, and learn it more closely by receiving His Holy Spirit, and sharing His salvation.

This sacred treasure will enable you to meet with equal firmness both the faces of fortune. In days of prosperity it will preserve you from the vices of insolence and ingratitude; in days of adversity it will fill you with peace and quietness, strewing your rough path with flowers, and sweetening the bitter cup of affliction. And should you ever meet with an hour when earthly prospects shall fail, when friendship itself shall forsake you, then may you find relief in this unfailing source of consolation; then shall you be able to trust in its Divine Author, whose law is love, and who has taught us to forgive and love our enemies. In all the vicissitudes of life, amidst the infirmities of age and the prospects of dissolution, this supplies a refuge from the storm, turning darkness into day, and inspiring the bright hope of immortality. Let this be the grand object in your view in all the pursuits of life, and it will be an enduring treasure, that oblivion cannot hide nor time destroy. Earthly honors will pass away, the laurels of the hero will fade, cities and kingdoms be blotted from the world; but this shall brighten in the shades of death, and flourish through the eternal ages. With the pleasing hope that you may feel its influence in life, enjoy its consolations in death, and share its riches in a future state, I commend you to that God who has watched over your childhood, guarded your youth, and is able to crown you with life and felicity.

AN ADDRESS

Delivered before the Middletown Colonization Society, at their Annual Meeting, July 4th, 1834. By D. D. Whedon, *Professor of Languages in the Wesleyan University.*

In presenting to the audience the interests of the society whose cause I advocate, I am conscious of an appropriate unison between the subject and the day. To embalm the memory of the illustrious dead,—to recall before the mind's eye the scenes of our past eventful history,—to contemplate the blessings and the privileges with which all-bounteous Providence hath crowned our happy land, might indeed furnish matter for spirit-stirring thought; but what more grateful homage can we pay to the illustrious departed, or what greater proof of our worthiness of such an ancestry, than to aid in diffusing over other continents, the freedom which their heroism, under God, purchased for ours?

The Colonization Society, in its origin, history, and purposes, is unique and original. Liberia stands alone upon the world's map—alone in the world's history. Other emigrations have gone forth,—but they have been driven by persecution, or lured alone by hardy adventure; other national projects have been founded,—but they have been based merely upon the hope of gain or of ambition: this alone has gone forth from the spontaneous outpourings of private Christian munificence, and laid its foundations not merely upon the basis of self aggrandizement, but upon the eternal principles of national benevolence and universal philanthropy.

Its origin was as striking as is its character. Within a small room, in the nation's capital, in the year 1817, some twelve men assembled, unsurrounded by any of the insignia of power, save the dignity of their own noble characters, quietly and calmly to project the plan so portentous of bright hopes to unconscious, slumbering Africa. It was a scene which the heart suppresses its pulsations to contemplate. Were they even conscious of the simple, yet striking sublimity of their own movements? Some calculations of a grand prospective might have opened upon them, but national events and gigantic enterprises were business matters to such minds. Happy men! many of you have enjoyed hours of proud triumph, but none so thrilling a moment as that: some of you will have left honorable memorials of your existence, but none a more illustrious monument than the enterprise of that memorable day.

A project so bold was little likely to be received with universal concurrence. The era of stupendous philanthropic enterprise had not then arrived; the timid trembled at it as impracticable, and the skeptical ridiculed it as visionary. The advocates of slavery, almost *en masse*, were opposed to it as likely to disturb, ultimately, the existing state of things. A few even of these for awhile supported it, under the notion, that by rendering slavery more safe, it would confirm the permanence of that relation. Their desertion, while it subtracted something from its numerical strength, did, by relieving the steadfast and philanthropic slave-holding supporters from the suspicion of similar interested motives, really add to its moral force. The jealous northerner could

hardly believe that any philanthropy could come from a slave holder, and it required this sifting to bring out, in clear relief and bold action, the *slave-holding enemy of slavery.* Slowly and gradually did these jealousies lessen; national philanthropy has constantly been disclosing in new effort the energies that were slumbering in her arm; and in accordance with the spirit of the age, the Colonization Society has gone on, trusting to the splendor of its success for the refutation of the calumnies it endured, and exulting in the complete vindication of its own resplendent beneficence, in the ultimate monument of its labors, beyond the broad Atlantic.

The first direct movement of the Colonization Society, was in the year 1817, to send out two agents, (one of whom was the lamented Samuel J. Mills,) for the purpose of exploring the western coast of Africa. In 1820, eighty-eight colonists, under the care of three agents, were sent; but as they arranged matters so unfortunately as to arrive there during the sickly rainy season, the news was soon announced in this country, that the three agents, with more than twenty colonists, were carried off by the fever of the climate, heightened by exposure, fatigue, and want of medical aid. By no means disheartened at this melancholy result, the succeeding year twenty-eight more colonists were sent out, the spot was selected, the emigrants settled, and at the close of the year 1821, the foundations were laid of that colony, which has since received the name of *Liberia.*

The country to which this appropriate name has been given, is a sea-coast strip of about 280 miles in length and 30 in breadth, separated from the eastern interior by a belt of almost impassable forests. Its soil, well watered by beautiful streams, is said to reward an easy cultivation with all the productions of tropical climates. The harbor of Monrovia, the principal town, pronounced to be the best between Gibraltar and the Cape of Good Hope, is already visited by the flags of the different commercial nations. The varied successes and calamities, resulting sometimes from inevitable providences, and sometimes from the errors and mismanagements incident to so untried a scheme, and the statements which would result in the obviation of many popular objections, I have not time to detail. Catastrophies it has suffered, but these have been merely sufficient to try the nerve, not to dishearten the soul. It has been keenly and justly scrutinized, but has never shrunk; it has been fiercely scathed, but not broken. About twelve years have passed since her first founding, and yet, through vicissitude and disaster, through the desertion of friends and the hostilities of opponents, through invasion and disease, Liberia has held her triumphant way; and never more triumphant than at the present moment, she still stands the child of Christian benevolence, the nursling of a guardian providence, the hope of unborn nations.

It is not denied that its enemies may point to many errors and failures, but these are merely incidentals which affect not the main question; while on the other hand, it may be safely asserted that not only has the colony accomplished all that could have been expected in so brief a progress, but that few benefactions, at so small an expense, occupying so little hitherto of public attention, and in the face of so formidable an opposition, have effected so much good. Upon the very spot where Liberia now presents an asylum of liberty, was once the

theatre of the slave trade, the market place of human souls. Without claiming that the colony is a *miniature millenium*, it may confidently be asserted that a settlement possessing even the average morality of an American village with its intellectual advantages, will be, in the so sarcastically echoed language of Mr. Clay, 'a missionary of civilization and religion.' No one who has observed the susceptibility of the African character to the influences of civilization, can reasonably doubt the efficacy of such a contiguity; and it little becomes the professed peculiar friend of the negro to depreciate the noble traits that characterize that race. The native of our forests seems all but inaccessible to our most philanthropic efforts. Invite him to a civilized home, he comes and goes—a savage. Educate him, and he flies back to his forest again—a savage. Isolate a whole tribe within surrounding civilization, and he withers and dies away—a savage. But the African, on the other hand, with a spirit which, rightly understood, is above all ridicule, and susceptible of the noblest direction, loves the privileges, aspires to the refinements, and catches the decorums of social life. Yet he does this, under the pressure of a cruel and overwhelming public contempt; he does it at the expense of an infamous ridicule, which finds a warrant for heartless insult in the color of his face, wherever he shows it. But if this be here the case, under the weight of so tremendous an oppression, what must be the fact when he stands upon his own free soil, where ridicule hushes its cowardly tones, and he acknowledges no superior but his God? Can it be that these noble elements will not take a still nobler aspiration, when the exalting prospect of freedom and of empire open before him, upon his own ancestral land? His spirit would swell at the touch of his own free soil like the Highland chief's, restored to his country and his clan, when 'his foot was again upon his native hills, and his name was M'Gregor!' And when the splendid miracles of civilized life are exhibited, in all their wonders, before the native African, who, possessing the same original noble capacity, has never bowed his neck to the slaver's chain,—when he learns, by the example of his own brother, of his own hue, that these are not the patent prerogatives of a white skin, will not the same predisposition to catch and arrogate the proud advantages of elevated character, prompt them to seize and transfer from man to man, and from tribe to tribe, the ennobling qualities to be acquired from civilization, science, and Christianity? I appeal to fact. Upon the shore of Africa is arising an infant nation, exhibiting gradually many of the blessings of organized government; its schools are offering the rudiments, and its high schools will soon offer the superior branches of education; its infant cities, extending their streets over a soil to which they are giving a constantly-rising value; its press, diffusing the means of popular information; its harbors, visited by the floating banners of the different nations of the earth; its courts and its legislative halls dictating and dispensing wholesome laws, and its sacred spires pointing to heaven, emblematic of that religion whose spirit breathes their life into all these institutions, and offers the same blessings of science and of salvation even to them. And what are the effects? Brief time as these causes have had to develope and operate, and retarded as they have been by accidental misunderstandings, pushed into open hostilities, already has many a prelude to a full appreciation of these advan-

tages displayed itself. Thousands have put themselves under the protection of the colony; their youth are catching the spirit of education; surrounding nations are anxious for the advantages of their intercourse, and neighboring kings have been clamorous for the benefits of their friendship. The conquest of prejudices, the exhibition of the utilities of civil life, and the transformation of the character, are not indeed the work of so brief a day. Who does not know that the commencement presents the great contest; that every new gain will present new facilities for still greater successes? Of the hundreds your schools educate, each may become the teacher, in geometric ratio, of other hundreds, and you know not what enkindling spark, rising and spreading, like the conflagration of our own summer prairies, may diffuse its light, and shed a new lustre over that now benighted, yet noble-spirited population.

I hear you say, perhaps, 'Aye, but this is too romantic a picture for plain matter of fact men.' I am addressing a Christian assembly; in many who are most skeptical on this subject, I cordially recognize the Christian character. Of them I ask, Shall Ethiopia stretch forth her hands to God? Shall the earth be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea? And shall Africa be overspread with the light of Christianity and civilization? The picture then is touched, not with the hues of romance—but of inspiration. The coloring is not mine,—but your Bible's;—and I am but a faint copyist. You grant then, that the hope is not visionary; the scheme is not impracticable. Our purpose is to realize this picture, and you concede that that purpose will be accomplished. And what auxiliary more effective could the missionary enterprise desire, than Liberia presents? Here may be the grand depot of resources; the great organization of plans. What fitter place for the herald of Christianity to rest his foot, and replume his wing for his flight into the dark interior?

But it is not in revelation alone that I read noble promises of renovation for Africa. He studies men and things carelessly and coldly, who does not discover consoling lessons of hope for the future. The series of past history,—the progressive character of the human mind,—the successively-brightening dispensations of Providence tell me, that the world is a school whose bitterest lessons have been learned, and whose brightest are yet to come. Does any man believe that Africa shall not yet show a brighter page, or fear that perpetual darkness is to wrap her fair fields and fertile vales? No; the genius of the age,—the spirit of Christian enterprise,—the character, the command, and the promises of Heaven forbid it, and cheer us on in the prosecution of *our* great design.

It has been the fortune of Liberia to live down objection, and to stand in herself their triumphant refutation. An eminent and revered character who has avowed a change of views, adverse to the Colonization Society, has stated that by the non-consent or unanimous opposition of the colored people of this country, 'the society is *morally annihilated.*' Now, laying aside the refutation of this assertion, which arises from the fact that want of emigrants has never been one of the embarrassments of the society, we may confidently look to the *success of the colony*, for the effecting an entire and opportune change of their views of the subject. So far is the opposition of the mass of the

colored population from being a *moral annihilation* of the colony, that it is altogether probable that it has been its preservation. Had it been universally popular, previous to the full success of the colony, and had there been a rush, in mass, of our colored population, fatal indeed might have been the result. But meanwhile they have entertained fearful visions of the inhospitable and pestilential character of the country; and the colored man has learned to prefer this land of civilization, with all its oppressions, to the unknown horrors of such a refuge. Liberia has appeared to him a monster beyond the ocean, whose voracity was ever insatiable, and whose cry was ever clamorous for victims like him. Nor have the views of his advisers been apparently much more correct. The simple offer of the Colonization Society to aid him, if he preferred to emigrate, has by a strange application of terms been styled banishment, forcible expatriation, and what not. Leaving this infelicitous *mismanagement* of words to its own fate, we are confident that the colored men of this country will, without any logic of ours, become completely disabused on this subject. The *colony itself* will console their fears, and render any forcible expulsion unnecessary. Liberia will yet proudly rise, be her own vindicator, and their asylum. Pour the energies of national philanthropy upon her; make her resplendent with success; and, rising like a beacon of hope and of refuge, the power of the attraction on her part over the negro will render perfectly unnecessary any repulsion upon ours.

But not less striking will be the effect of the colony upon those who may ultimately remain. An earnest, and no doubt philanthropic desire is expressed, by the professed friends of the colored population, for the elevation of their character among us. I fully coincide in that desire, and deeply reprobate any causes operating to prevent a just amelioration of their condition. At the same time, however, we may differ, materially, with regard to the means of effecting such a purpose. I would, at least, be cautious, how I inspired them with a sullen venom toward evils which at present were irremovable. I would hesitate to produce a transformation in their character, which should place them in a warfare of feeling against the whites, that may aggravate, but can never relieve their misery. This constitutes to them a bitter taste of the tree of knowledge; for while it does not really elevate their character, it draws down upon them more heavily that very depression which constitutes their misery. This is, in fact, precisely reversing the desired effect, for it is redoubling the great cause of their depression—the severe and contemptuous opinion of the whites toward them.

Let then some triumphant vindicator of their character stand forth upon the world's eye; prove the native nobleness of their minds, and dissolve the strange association that exists between a negro and a semi-brute; and you demolish the evil in its strong hold, for you abolish the deep-laid prejudices of the whites. Such a vindicator the success of Liberia would present. For once, in the course of modern history, you will give the negro character fair play for developing itself, and one such tangible, living, towering demonstration will be worth ten thousand abstract arguments.

Nor less effective will be the operation toward the grand result—the final staying of the curse—the ultimate abolition of slavery.

Every Liberian ship, commissioned by African enterprise, would wave its banners within our ports, a more powerful preacher of emancipation than a whole flying cohort of itinerant lecturers. Laying aside the consideration, that the withdrawal of the dangerous influence of the free blacks would give the master a breathing spell from the horror of his fears, and permit the operation of better and kindlier feelings; laying aside the consideration, that by providing the emancipating slave master a safe method, and the slave a secure refuge, it would relieve the country from the dangers of pouring upon society a vagabond horde from the southern hot houses; aside, I say, from these important considerations, it must be, that every expanding institution upon the African coast, should cause the negro to 'swell beyond the measure of his chain.' He is own brother to a rising nation, and the master cannot be blind to the dignifying effect of the relationship. Upon that rising people the nations of the civilized world are collecting their philanthropy; and that generous sentiment must reflect in sympathy upon the slave, and indignation upon the still remaining masters. Under the united effect of these intense and concentrated and increasing influences, it cannot but be, that the iron fetter shall dissolve from around the slave, and he join the emancipated nations of the earth.

For many years, the main contest of the Colonization Society was with the friends of slavery, the timid jealousies of fearful supporters, and the intrinsic difficulties of the project itself. Of late, however, it has arisen from a new and unexpected quarter—the professed and ardent patrons themselves of the negro. In the year 1832, a new scheme announced itself for his relief, designing to erect itself upon the ruins of the colonization plan. In brief, the proposition of the emancipationist is, to induce the southerner to immediately free his slaves. The proposition of the colonizationist is, to offer to all who are freed, the opportunity and facilities of a spontaneous voluntary emigration, to the land from which the slave has been stolen. Now upon the first flush one is inclined to ask, What is there incompatible in these two plans? If the emancipationist have any means of peaceably inducing the southerner to manumit the slave, why not apply to it, and allow the colonizationist, in his own sphere, to complete the benefaction, by restoring every manumitted slave, who desires it, to the land of his ancestry? Will the emancipationist reiterate the stale objection, that colonization timidly leaves the relation of master and slave undisturbed, and so abandons the poor negro to the cruelty of his oppressor? Then let him apply himself, not to destroy the benefit of colonization, but to supply the field of benevolence which it leaves untouched. What should we say, were the Bible Society to denounce the missionary scheme, because it impiously supported the plan of evangelizing the world, by mere fallible men, and left the benighted heathen to perish for want of the volume of inspiration? In both cases, each society has, and should have, without impeding the other, its own sphere of operation.

But the very originator of the new scheme settled, in the outset, all question of compromise. His scheme came forth from his brain, like Pallas from Jupiter's, armed and equipped with warlike proclamation, and belligerent attitude. Under a better command, the broad sea of universal benevolence might have been wide enough for both;

and *their* superadded auxiliary banners might, perhaps, have waved under better auspices, in hope and freedom to Africa: but their first launch was defiance, their first salute, a broadside. Mr. Garrison announced his opposition, in a style warm with fulminating energy, and rich with inventiveness of imagination. He pronounced the society a 'conspiracy against human rights;' he asserted that 'the superstructure of the society rests upon the following pillars—1. Persecution; 2. Falsehood; 3. Cowardice; 4. Infidelity.' 'If,' says he, 'I do not prove the Colonization Society to be a creature without brains, eyeless, unnatural, hypocritical, relentless, and unjust, let me be covered with confusion of face.' This pretty bouquet of epithets was culled, let it be remembered, for such men as Lafayette, President Madison, Judge Marshall, Bishops Mead and M'Kendree, Webster and Frelinghuysen, men of different sections, political parties, and religious denominations. Of this liberal spirit, Mr. Garrison has made no monopoly; he has imparted the same style of rhetoric to his whole school. The master chorister has given the key note, and the tune has been run through the whole octave of discordant strains.

The professed purposes of the Anti-Slavery Society, with regard to slavery itself, will be considered as twofold—The awakening a more active abhorrence of slavery in the north; and the inducing the southerners to bring about the immediate emancipation of their slaves.

To effect the former of these two purposes, all the topics of glowing declamation, of which slavery is so fertile, are put in requisition. Most conclusive proofs of the negro's right to his liberty, where nobody doubts it; most fervid denunciations of slavery, where no slavery exists; most magnanimous professions of a readiness for martydom, where there is no danger of it; and a most prudent avoidance of those regions where there might be such a danger, constitute a very rich field, for a very safe display of heroics and tragics. To such a paroxism of rhetoric, the cool New-Englander listens, and when it is spent, he feels, perhaps, inclined to reply, 'Why, sir, if it be merely your purpose to prove that slavery is horribly bad, or that two and two make four, from my very soul, I never doubted one of these facts more than the other.' He most justly feels that there is a great waste of logic and oratory expended in inculcating such feelings upon him. Not blazing out into angry effervescence, but deep in his heart, there is an abhorrence of slavery, whether pressing upon the caste of India, the serf of Russia, or the negro of Carolina, which renders this declamation quite a superfluity.

But these stirring movements are but preparatory to their other grand purpose of inspiring the southern mind with the purpose of manumitting their slaves. With regard to the practicability of immediate emancipation, I shall say nothing; for there exists a previous consideration, which, in my humble opinion, should, of itself, put an arresting veto upon the abolitionist's career. It is one thing to demonstrate that practicability to the New-Englander, and another thing to bring it home upon the southerner: and every procedure of the abolitionist has tended to close the southern ear against him. The very worst temper shuts the valve against the very best argument. To whisper a syllable of all the palliating circumstances that mitigate the slave holder's guilt, they denounce as an infamous apology for

slavery. They paint the master, born to his condition, in all the blackness of the original kidnapper; they make it a crime in the colonizationist, that he holds possession of the most liberal slave master's confidence: the late report of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society hurls forth the reproach, with marks of exclamation, that the legislatures of five slave-holding states had passed highly encomiastic resolutions upon the Colonization Society; and are these the men whom the south are likely to adopt as their guides and counsellors? On the contrary, the presence of their publications would be cursed, as a calamitous visitation of destruction. It destroys the confidence between master and slave, rendering the former fearfully suspicious, and the latter more terribly oppressed; it checks the rising sympathy, crushes the expanding liberality, and binds faster the iron fetter. By a strange fatuity, this society proclaims the fact, (as if utterly unconscious how much they were its causes,) that during the last two years five slave-holding states had passed laws of still more rigorous severity than had ever yet disgraced their statute books. Vainly do they tell us that these facts but prove and aggravate the southern infatuation. Our reply is,—Admit their guilt in all its damning blackness, your precepts but instigate them, in fact, to still deeper crime; and your protection plunges the slave in still darker misery. You would convince the south, while the south is one mass of adamant, against every syllable you send upon her, and every movement you make but confirms the solidity. Your main success is in defeating yourselves; your advance is—backward; and when the bonds of the slave shall be finally broken, it will be, not in consequence, but in spite of your sadly-mistaken efforts.

But you will rouse the slumbering spirit of the north, then. Alas! what will you then have gained toward persuading the slave holder of the south? All the north may most religiously hold to abolitionism, and all the south may most impiously denounce it. Old experience tells us that the eternal Potomac may be a most impassable boundary line of opinions. You have but to make New-England a whirlpool of abolitionism, to make the south the precise reverse. The very fact that we are in a blaze of commotion, burning for interference, will, by a revulsion of feeling, produce an opposite partizanship, and seal our fate, perhaps for centuries. The seers of European despotism have yearly pointed to our slaves, and prophesied for us approaching dissolution—and you are hastening its verification. The tottering despot has gazed upon our fearful example, with terror for his fate, and nightly sent up his prayers for our ruin—and you are becoming the minister of their fulfilment.

I am far from asserting that any of our fellow citizens are friends to a dissolution of our union; yet am I mistaken if there are not some, who would contemplate even that as an admissible means for effecting what they suppose the most righteous of purposes; who would consider any regard to its preservation as a wicked preference of expediency to right: misguided men, who would march to slave emancipation over the ruins of the demolished constitution! Without asking what right there can be in endangering the happiness and liberties of the whole for the benefit of one-sixth; are they so moonstruck as not to see that a revolution which ruined the union, would, in all proba-

bility, plunge in deeper ruin the object of their fond solicitude, the slave? While they lost every thing for all else, they would gain nothing for him. Are their eyes so bewildered, as that through scenes of civil strife, through the smoke of battle and of massacre, they can descry visions of peace and freedom for the slave? But I turn from the sickening picture: in calm reliance upon the good sense of our citizens, the better genius of my country, and the guidance of the God of our fathers, I prophesy, *such scenes shall never be.*

I turn to a more attractive object—the saving policy of this society, and the rising monument of its benevolence upon another hemisphere, *—the benefactress of two continents—the mediatrix between two races, —pointing the path of peace to America, and regeneration to Africa.*

Say not that I calculate too warmly for Africa. He has not wisely studied the history of his own country, who has not learned how feeble beginnings have eventuated the grandest results. Roll back the pictured scroll of chronicled ages, and reveal to me a glimpse of two centuries ago. I see a lonely ship approaching the shore of a forest continent,—yet hanging, as it does, in trembling suspense upon the tossing wave,—I fear not for its heaven-guided fate;—for its fragile deck is freighted with an empire's destinies. Flung by persecution's hand upon Plymouth's rock—in spite of the wintry blast, the dense forest, the sterile soil, the savage foe, and the despot's oppression,—that pilgrim band of adventurous voyagers have swelled to the mighty empire that now sits upon New-England's hills, shadows her coast, and hurls her thunders upon the broad Atlantic. And my friends, what is proud history for us, is prouder prophecy for Africa. Far less difficulties has a rising nation upon her peaceful and fertile shores,—far less visionary to appearance are the prospects we hope for her, than the realities which history presents for us. Beside, the day has been when Africa was the proudest of her sister continents. The diadem of nations is no stranger to her sable brow;—her fields and shores are the seat of old dominion. The shadows of departed empires, older than the birth of history, are hovering round her eternal pyramids!

Who would have it recorded of him that he aided not in Africa's restoration? Better be her buried martyr than her living foe. Most truly have our opposers published, that no man would like to have it recorded upon his tomb stone, '*This man advocated the slave trade.*' Such an epitaph would indeed be a marble execration. But a still deeper monumental sarcasm would be, *Here lies the man who out of pure love for the African, would have prevented the regeneration of Africa.*

And who would not claim it as a rich privilege to make a sacrifice for her emancipation? When the world shall have better learned to estimate true glory, her benefactors and martyrs will receive the homage long paid to the warrior's deeds. I hear the funeral sigh, wafted by the breeze across the Atlantic wave, telling that another—and another—*is fallen!* There are those *among us*, whose tears, for the severing of the nearest ties, have demanded our sympathies. Hushed is the mercy-breathing voice, and cold the generous beating heart; yet the green sod above them is sacred—bedewed with the tears of Ethiopia's living sons, and hallowed with the reverence of her coming generations. Their names, entwined with her history, shall be the inspiration of

future song, and the theme of future story. They came from a far land, bearing hope to the despairing and life to the dying: they were heroes who fell in a battle unstained with blood: they will repose like priceless gems upon Africa's grateful bosom;—and in the day of eternity they will rise from the most glorious of all mausoleums—A CONTINENT *their lives were sacrificed to redeem.*

If, against all human probability, the enterprise for which they suffered, and we toil, be a mistaken one, the noble humanity of its motive will fully sanctify the error of its adoption;—if, in the dispensation of a mysterious providence, it be ultimately prostrated, it shall be sufficient for us to have deserved success;—and, with the full hopes of that success, in the name of God, and in the name of man, we commend it to your holiest sympathies, your richest liberality, and your most devoted exertion.

THE CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHER:

Or, the Connection of Science and Philosophy with Religion.
By THOMAS DICK.

THE man who can soar high into the regions of philosophy, understanding that word according to its modern acceptation, cannot long remain an infidel. However much some have decried learning and science as detrimental to religion, the history of the Church and of the world proves, that every revival of true godliness has been accompanied with a revival of sound learning, of deep research into various branches of knowledge, and by an assiduous cultivation of the arts which adorn life, and add to the comforts of civilized society. Even those scientific infidels who have sported with the blessings and miseries of life, and have laughed at death and judgment while they seemed at a distance from them, have borrowed their plumes from the bird of paradise: the schools of learning and philosophy at which they studied were founded and nourished by Christian philanthropy.

Every one will be convinced of the truth of these remarks by looking over those dark ages of the Church which preceded the reformation, and comparing the puerile productions of that sombre period with those of subsequent times. Ever since Luther thrust his sword into the heart of popery, and produced those writhings in the Romish Church which indicated the anguish she felt under the deep wound which he inflicted, the lights of science have been steadily burning brighter and brighter, and, we humbly trust, will continue to rise with more and more splendor, even 'to the perfect day.' Deep research, profound knowledge, and accurate investigation, always have led, and must always continue to lead, to an acknowledgment of that Great Supreme Intelligence which made, upholds, and governs the world.

We do not, indeed, subscribe to the opinion adopted by some, that a study of the works of nature will of itself lead to an accurate know-

ledge of God's perfections. That He exists is one thing, but what His will is concerning His creatures is another. That the existence of the universe indicates the existence also of an infinitely wise, powerful, and eternal Being, must, we think, be allowed on all hands. The marks of intelligence every where visible throughout the creation assure us that the world, with all its appurtenances, must have been framed by an intelligence superior to all human intelligences.

Let us try the strength of this argument. Bring the united strength and intelligence of all human beings together, and they cannot produce a machine capable of perpetual motion. A man indeed may construct machines, which, by the aid of the agencies of nature—such as the wind or water mill, steam and wind vessels—will move of themselves at certain distances, and for a length of time; but the power which propels them forward is soon exhausted, and the machines themselves soon wear out by continual friction, and the impairing influence of the atmosphere and other corroding agents. But we behold a world, inert of itself, moving around in the most regular order as to time and distance, upheld and directed by a power and influence to us invisible; and these motions have been continued from the beginning of time, and still continue on without variation, unimpaired by time, unwasted by the exhaustion of its own energies, and unwearied by the exertion of its powers. Who made this world? By what power is it kept in perpetual motion? The answer to these questions silences atheism. Whoever that Being is, He must be possessed of all those perfections which are adequate to the production of such a world. And by whatever power this world is upheld and perpetually moved and directed, this power must be infinite, for no finite hand is adequate to produce such a result.

So far, we think, natural religion will lead us, and no farther—unless, indeed, we may infer the *goodness* of this Being, from the provision which is made for the support and comfort of his intelligent creatures. But, though His munificence is manifestly perceivable from the aptitude of the means to supply the wants, and to administer to the happiness of all rational and animated existences, yet there are a multitude of evils in the world—evils that cannot, by any human means, be either removed or mitigated. Whence these evils? Did they originate from God? If He made the world as it now is, then they surely did. Are these evils the emanations of His goodness? Nay, surely. Allowing that they proceeded from Him, as an effect follows its cause, or as the stream flows from its fountain, it will follow most inevitably that a principle of evil as well as good exists in the Deity; and hence those heathen philosophers, who attributed to their deities all those infamous passions and appetites which they saw influencing men, reasoned accurately enough, because they took their

data as they found them here in this world, where good and evil are mixed together; and supposing that the world as it is was the production of the gods, they inferred that these were possessed of the same malignant passions which they saw actuated men, and that they delighted in afflicting mankind with all those temporal evils, sickness, pain, war and famine, pestilence and death, which were so prevalent in the world. And allowing them the firm possession of their premises, that the world is as the gods made it, and that all human actions were the result of an uncontrollable fate, their conclusions were legitimate and irresistible, being built upon the well-known and acknowledged maxim, 'that a cause partakes of the moral likeness of its effects.' And as their morality allowed of cunning, artifice, murder, and blood-shedding among men, the objects of their idolatrous worship were invested, in the imagination of their votaries, with the same propensities, and considered no less worthy of their veneration for being actuated by the same unhallowed passions.

What shall we say? Nature gives us no authentic information respecting the origin of these evils, except that they proceeded from the same cause which produced the universe. Were we left then to her dim light, we should be for ever in the dark respecting the attributes of truth, holiness, and goodness, which we now believe inhere in the Deity whom we worship. Hence we said that the study of nature alone cannot conduct us to a knowledge of His perfections, and especially of His goodness, from whence issue those streams of mercy with which we are blessed, notwithstanding the many 'ills which flesh is heir to.' From this admission we derive an irrefutable argument in favor of a revelation of His will, to make us acquainted with the exuberance of His goodness in providing for our wants, in procuring a remedy for our evils, and in making known to us the nature and measure of our duty. This volume of revelation also leads us to the fountain of human misery, the origin of moral evil, whence springs those numerous natural evils with which mankind have always been afflicted. And hence we infer that the world is not now as it was when it dropped perfect from the hand of the mighty Architect—that man has descended from that high dignity he was originally destined to sustain at the head of the creation—that he has departed from his primeval purity, innocency, and happiness—and that therefore he is degraded, depraved, and shrouded in a mantle of darkness—that his understanding is weak, and his whole soul perverse—and that from all this it follows, that man alone, not his Maker, is responsible for the disorders, moral and natural evils,—the latter being a consequence of the former,—which pour their full tide over the plains of human existence. Hence the Deity, whom we adore, appears 'full orb'd, with His whole round of rays complete,' high above all those malig-

nant passions which characterize, debase, and influence human beings. But for this conclusion, so honorable to the Creator of the universe, we are indebted to the light poured upon our dark world by the lamp of revelation.

This is the spiritual sun which the Creator hath suspended in the celestial firmament, for the purpose of giving light and heat to the moral world. When reason is enlightened by a ray from this bright luminary, it can perceive its adorable Author, trace out the perfections of His character, and accurately deduce all those truths and duties which guide the understanding and regulate the conduct of mankind; and the more expanded the mind becomes by science, by study, and reflection, the more clearly does it perceive the objects which are thus revealed, and the more accurately does it draw its conclusions from those truths thus perspicuously made known.

The professed object of the work before us is to show the union between religion and science, and the manner in which the one assists the other; and that, by shedding their mutual light on the mind of man, they infallibly conduct him to a knowledge of the Great Supreme, and finally to glory and immortality.

In his introduction, Mr. Dick glances at the sad condition of those nations who have been destitute of the lights of revelation, in the following manner:—

'On the subject of religion, mankind have, in all ages, been prone to run into extremes. While some have been disposed to attach too much importance to the mere exertions of the human intellect, and to imagine that man, by the light of unassisted reason, is able to explore the path to true wisdom and happiness,—the greater part of religionists, on the other hand, have been disposed to treat scientific knowledge, in its relation to religion, with a degree of indifference bordering upon contempt. Both these dispositions are equally foolish and preposterous. For he who exalts human reason, as the only sure guide to wisdom and felicity, forgets that man, in his present state, is a *depraved* intelligence, and, consequently, liable to err; and that all those who have been left solely to its dictates have uniformly failed in attaining these desirable objects. During a period of more than 5,800 years, the greater part of the human race have been left solely to the guidance of their rational powers, in order to grope their way to the temple of knowledge, and the portals of immortality; but what has been the result of all their anxious researches? Instead of acquiring correct notions of the Great Author of their existence, and of the nature of that homage which is due to his perfections, "they have become vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts have been darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they have become fools; and have changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to four-footed beasts, and creeping things." Instead of acquiring correct views of the principles of moral action, and conducting themselves according to the eternal rules of

rectitude, they have displayed the operation of the most diabolical passions, indulged in continual warfare, and desolated the earth with rapine and horrid carnage; so that the history of the world presents to our view little more than a series of revolting details of the depravity of our species, and of the wrongs which one tribe of human beings has wilfully inflicted upon another.

This has been the case not only among a few uncultivated hordes on the coasts of Africa, in the plains of Tartary, and the wilds of America, but even among those nations which stood highest in the ranks of civilization and of science. The ancient Greeks and Romans, who boasted of their attainments in philosophy, and their progress in the arts, entertained the most foolish, contradictory, and unworthy notions of the object of Divine worship, of the requirements of religion, and of the eternal destiny of man. They adored a host of divinities characterized by impiety, fraud, injustice, falsehood, lewdness, treachery, revenge, murder, and every other vice which can debase the human mind, instead of offering a tribute of rational homage to that Supreme Intelligence who made, and who governs the universe. Even their priests and philosophers indulged in the most degrading and abominable practices, and entertained the most irrational notions in regard to the origin of the universe, and the moral government of the world. Most of them denied a future state of retribution, and all of them had their doubts respecting the reality of an immortal existence; and as to the doctrine of a resurrection from the dead, they never dreamed of such an event, and scouted the idea when proposed to them as the climax of absurdity. The glory to which their princes and generals aspired was to spread death and destruction among their fellow men—to carry fire and sword, terror and dismay, and all the engines of destruction through surrounding nations —to fill their fields with heaps of slain—to plunder the survivors of every earthly comfort, and to drag captive kings at their chariot wheels —that they might enjoy the splendor and the honors of a triumph. What has been now stated with regard to the most enlightened nations of antiquity will equally apply to the present inhabitants of China, of Hindostan, of the Japanese islands, of the Birman empire, and of every other civilized nation on which the light of revelation has never shone —with this additional consideration, That they have enjoyed an additional period of 1800 years for making farther investigations; and are, at this moment, as far from the object of their pursuit as when they first commenced their researches; and not only so, but some of these nations, in modern times, have mingled with their abominable superstitions and idolatries many absurdities and horrid cruelties which were altogether unknown among the Greek and Roman population.

Such are the melancholy results to which men have been led, when left to the guidance of unassisted reason, in the most interesting and important of all investigations. They have wandered in the mazes of error and delusion; and their researches, instead of directing and expanding our religious views, have tended only to bewilder the human mind, and to throw a deeper shade of intellectual gloom over our apostate world. After a period of six thousand years has been spent in anxious inquiries after the path to true knowledge and happiness, ignorance, superstition, idolatry, vice, and misery still continue to sway

their sceptre over the great majority of the human race; and, if we be allowed to reason from the past to the future, we may rest assured, that while mankind are destitute of a Guide superior to the glimmerings of depraved reason, they would be no nearer the object of their pursuit, after the lapse of *sixty thousand years*, than at the present moment. It is only in connection with the discoveries of revelation that we can expect that the efforts of human reason and activity will be successful in abolishing the reign of ignorance and degrading superstition—in illuminating the benighted tribes of the pagan world—and in causing "righteousness, and order, and peace, to spring forth before all the nations." Though the Christian religion has never yet been fully understood and recognized, in all its aspects and bearings, nor its requirements been cordially complied with, by the great body of those who profess to believe in its Divine origin, yet it is only in those nations who have acknowledged its authority, and, in some measure, submitted to its dictates, that any thing approximating to just conceptions of the Supreme Intelligence, and of his moral government, is found to prevail.

But, on the other hand, though the light of nature is of itself a feeble and insufficient guide to direct us in our views of the Supreme Intelligence, and of our eternal destination, yet it is a most dangerous and delusive error to imagine that reason, and the study of the material world, ought to be discarded from the science of religion. The man who would discard the efforts of the human intellect, and the science of nature from religion, forgets that He who is the Author of human redemption, is also the Creator and Governor of the whole system of the material universe—that it is one end of that moral renovation which the Gospel effects, to qualify us for contemplating aright the displays of Divine perfection which the works of creation exhibit—that the visible works of God are the principal medium by which he displays the attributes of his nature to intelligent beings—that the study and contemplation of these works employ the faculties of intelligences of a superior order (Rev. iv, 11; xv, 3, &c,)—that man, had he remained in primeval innocence, would have been chiefly employed in such contemplations—that it is one main design of Divine revelation to illustrate the operations of Providence, and the agency of God in the formation and preservation of all things—and that the Scriptures are full of sublime descriptions of the visible creation, and of interesting references to the various objects which adorn the scenery of nature. Without the cultivation of our reasoning powers, and an investigation of the laws and economy of nature, we could not appreciate many of the excellent characters, the interesting aspects, and the sublime references of revealed religion: we should lose the full evidence of those arguments by which the existence of God and his attributes of wisdom and omnipotence are most powerfully demonstrated: we should remain destitute of those sublime conceptions of the perfections and agency of Jehovah which the grandeur and immensity of his works are calculated to inspire: we should never perceive, in its full force, the evidence of those proofs on which the Divine authority of revelation is founded: we could not give a rational interpretation of the spirit and meaning of many parts of the sacred oracles; nor could we comply with those positive commands of God which enjoin us to con-

template the wonder of his power, to "meditate on all his works, and to talk of all his doings."'

It would be matter of rejoicing could we say, in truth, that all Christian nations had escaped from those sanguinary conflicts which have so frequently and so distressingly deluged the earth with blood. These things, however, are not justly chargeable upon Christianity. In spite of its mild precepts and bold remonstrances, the natural propensities of mankind have led them, in every age, among all nations, and under every form of religion, to trespass upon each other's rights, to desolate the earth with blood and carnage, and to riot upon the spoils unjustly taken from each other as the reward of their cruel valor. But such deeds of darkness are no more to be charged upon the Christian religion or upon the book of revelation, than the private murders, thefts, and robberies are to be attributed to those human laws which forbid them. Let Christianity have its legitimate effects upon the human heart, and all those evils, which have been, and are still so feelingly deprecated by philanthropists, shall be banished from the earth—peace and good will, and all the fruits of righteousness, shall pervade the human family.

In the first chapter Mr. Dick shows the union subsisting between natural and revealed religion, and that the necessity of a revelation to make known to man his duty and destiny, originates in his apostacy.

'The Christian revelation ought not to be considered as superseding the religion of nature, but as carrying it forward to perfection. It introduces the Deity to us under *new* relations, corresponding to the degraded state into which we have fallen. It is superadded to our natural relations to God, and takes it for granted that these natural relations must for ever subsist. It is true, indeed, that the essential attributes of God, and the principles of natural religion, cannot be fully discovered without the light of revelation, as appears from the past experience of mankind in every generation; but it is equally true, that, when discovered by the aid of this celestial light, they are of the utmost importance in the Christian system, and are as essentially connected with it as the foundation of a building is with the superstructure. Many professed Christians, however, seem to think, and to act, as if the Christian revelation had annulled the natural relations which subsist between man and the Deity; and hence the zealous outcry against every discussion from the pulpit that has not a *direct* relation to what are termed the doctrines of grace. But nothing, surely, can be more absurd than to carry out such a principle to all its legitimate consequences. Can God ever cease to be omnipotent, or can man ever cease to be dependent for existence on his infinite power? Can the Divine Being ever cease to be omnipresent and omniscient, or can man ever cease to be the object of his knowledge and superintendence? Can infinite wisdom ever be detached from the Almighty, or can man ever be in a situation where he will not experience the

effects of his wise arrangements? Can goodness ever fail of being an attribute of Jehovah, or can any sentient or intelligent beings exist that do not experience the effects of His bounty? In short, can the relation of *creature* and of *Creator* ever cease between the human race, in whatever moral or physical situation they may be placed, and that Almighty Being, "who giveth to all life, and breath, and all things?" If none of these things can possibly happen, then the relations to which we refer must be eternal and unchangeable, and must form the basis of all the other relations in which we can possibly stand to the Divine Being, either as apostate or as redeemed creatures; and therefore they ought to be exhibited as subjects for our frequent and serious contemplation, as religious and moral agents. But, unless we make such topics a distinct subject of attention, and endeavor to acquire a clear and comprehensive conception of our natural relations to God, we can never form a clear conception of those new and interesting relations into which we have been brought by the mediation of Jesus Christ.

If man had continued in his primitive state of integrity, he would have been for ever exercised in tracing the power, the beneficence, and other attributes of Deity, in the visible creation alone. Now that his fallen state has rendered additional revelations necessary, in order to secure his happiness, is he completely to throw aside those contemplations and exercises which constituted his chief employment, while he remained a pure moral intelligence? Surely not. One great end of his moral renovation by means of the Gospel, must be to enable him *to resume his primitive exercises*, and to qualify him for more enlarged views and contemplations of a similar nature, in that future world, where the physical and moral impediments which now obstruct his progress will be completely removed.

It appears highly unreasonable, and indicates a selfish disposition of mind, to magnify one class of the Divine attributes at the expense of another; to extol, for example, the mercy of God, and neglect to celebrate his power and wisdom—those glorious perfections, the display of which, at the formation of our globe, excited the rapture and admiration of angels, and of innocent man. All the attributes of God are *equal*, because all of them are *infinite*; and, therefore, to talk of *darling* attributes in the Divine nature, as some have done, is inconsistent with reason, unwarranted by Scripture, and tends to exhibit a distorted view of the Divine character. The Divine mercy ought to be celebrated with rapture by every individual of our fallen race: but with no less rapture should we extol the Divine omnipotence; for the designs of mercy cannot be accomplished without the intervention of infinite power. All that we hope for, in consequence of the promises of God, and of the redemption accomplished by Jesus Christ, must be founded on the conception we form of the operations of omnipotence. An example or two may not be unnecessary for illustrating this position.

We are warranted by the sacred oracles to entertain the hope, that these mortal bodies of ours, after they have mouldered in the dust, been dissolved into their primary elementary parts, and become the prey of devouring reptiles, during a lapse of generations or of centuries, shall spring forth from the tomb to new life and beauty, and be arrayed in more glorious forms than they now wear; yea, that all the inhabitants of our globe, from Adam to the end of time, though the

bodies of thousands of them have been devoured by cannibals, have become the food of fishes and of beasts of prey, and have been burnt to cinders, and their ashes scattered by the winds, over the different regions of sea and land, shall be reanimated by the voice of the Son of God, and shall appear, each in his proper person and identical body, before God, the Judge of all. Now, the firmness of our hope of so astonishing an event, which seems to contradict all experience, and appears involved in such a mass of difficulties and apparent contradictions, must be in proportion to the sentiments we entertain of the Divine intelligence, wisdom, and omnipotence. And where are we to find the most striking visible displays of these perfections, except in the actual operations of the Creator, within the range of our view in the material world?

Again: we are informed in the same Divine records, that, at some future period, the earth on which we now dwell shall be wrapt up in devouring flames, and its present form and constitution for ever destroyed; and its redeemed inhabitants, after being released from the grave, shall be transported to a more glorious region; and that "new heavens and a new earth shall appear, wherein dwelleth righteousness." The Divine mercy having given to the faithful the promise of these astonishing revolutions, and most magnificent events, our hopes of their being fully realized must rest on the infinite wisdom and omnipotence of Jehovah; and, consequently, if our views of these perfections be limited and obscure, our hope in relation to our future destiny will be proportionably feeble and languid, and will scarcely perform its office "as an anchor to the soul both sure and steadfast." It is not merely by telling a person that God is all-wise and all-powerful, that a full conviction of the accomplishment of such grand events will be produced. He must be made to see with his own eyes what the Almighty *has already done*, and what he is now doing in all the regions of universal nature which lie open to our inspection; and this cannot be effected without directing his contemplations to those displays of intelligence and power which are exhibited in the structure, the economy, and the revolutions of the material world.

If the propriety of these sentiments be admitted, it will follow that the more we are accustomed to contemplate the wonders of Divine intelligence and power, in the objects with which we are surrounded, the more deeply shall we be impressed with a conviction, and a confident hope, that all the purposes of Divine mercy will ultimately be accomplished in our eternal felicity. It will also follow, that, in proportion as the mind acquires a clear, and extensive, and a reverential view of the essential attributes of the Deity, and of those truths in connection with them, which are objects of contemplation common to all holy beings, in a similar proportion will it be impressed, and its attention arrested, by every other Divine subject connected with them. And it is doubtless owing to the want of such clear and impressive conceptions of the essential character of Jehovah, and of the first truths of religion, that the bulk of mankind are so little impressed and influenced by the leading doctrines and duties connected with the plan of the Gospel salvation, and that they entertain so many vague and untenable notions respecting the character and the objects of a superintending Providence. How often, for example, have we witnessed

expressions of the foolish and limited notions which are frequently entertained respecting the operations of Omnipotence? When it has been asserted that the earth, with all its load of continents and oceans, is in rapid motion through the voids of space—that the sun is ten hundred thousand times larger than the terraqueous globe—and that millions of such globes are dispersed throughout the immensity of nature—some, who have viewed themselves as enlightened Christians, have exclaimed at the impossibility of such facts as if they were beyond the limits of Divine power, and as if such representations were intended to turn away the mind from God and religion; while, at the same time, they have yielded a firm assent to all the vulgar notions respecting omens, apparitions, and hobgoblins, and to the supposed extraordinary powers of the professors of divination and witchcraft. How can such persons assent, with intelligence and rational conviction, to the dictates of revelation respecting the energies of Omnipotence which will be exerted at "the consummation of all things," and in those arrangements which are to succeed the dissolution of our sublunary system? A firm belief in the almighty power and unsearchable wisdom of God, as displayed in the constitution and movements of the material world, is of the utmost importance to confirm our faith and enliven our hopes of such grand and interesting events.

Notwithstanding the considerations now stated, which plainly evince the connection of the natural perfections of God with the objects of the Christian revelation, it appears somewhat strange that when certain religious instructors happen to come in contact with this topic, they seem as if they were beginning to tread upon forbidden ground; and, as if it were unsuitable to their office as Christian teachers, to bring forward the stupendous works of the Almighty to illustrate His nature and attributes. Instead of expatiating on the numerous sources of illustration, of which the subject admits, till the minds of their hearers are thoroughly affected with the view of the essential glory of Jehovah, they despatch the subject with two or three vague propositions, which, though logically true, make no impression upon the heart; as if they believed that such contemplations were suited only to carnal men and mere philosophers; and as if they were afraid lest the sanctity of the pulpit should be polluted by particular descriptions of those operations of the Deity which are perceived through the medium of the corporeal senses. We do not mean to insinuate, that the essential attributes of God, and the illustrations of them derived from the material world, should form the sole or the chief topics of discussion in the business of religious instruction: but, if the Scriptures frequently direct our attention to these subjects—if they lie at the foundation of all accurate and extensive views of the Christian revelation—if they be the chief subjects of contemplation to angels, and all other pure intelligences, in every region of the universe—and if they have a tendency to expand the minds of professed Christians, to correct their vague and erroneous conceptions, and to promote their conformity to the moral character of God—we cannot find out the shadow of a reason why such topics should be almost, if not altogether, overlooked, in the writings and the discourses of those who profess to instruct mankind in the knowledge of God, and the duties of His worship.

We are informed by our Saviour Himself that "this is life eternal, to

know thee the living and true God," as well as "Jesus Christ whom He hath sent." The knowledge of God, in the sense here intended, must include in it the knowledge of the natural and essential attributes of the Deity, or those properties of His nature by which He is distinguished from all "the idols of the nations." Such are His self existence, His all-perfect knowledge, His omnipresence, His infinite wisdom, His boundless goodness, and almighty power—attributes, which, as we have just now seen, lie at the foundation of all the other characters and relations of Deity revealed in the Scriptures. The acquisition of just and comprehensive conceptions of these perfections must therefore lie at the foundation of all profound veneration of the Divine Being, and of all that is valuable in religion. Destitute of such conceptions, we can neither feel that habitual *humility*, and that *reverence* of the majesty of Jehovah which His essential glory is calculated to inspire, nor pay Him that tribute of adoration and gratitude which is due to His name. Devoid of such views, we cannot exercise that cordial acquiescence in the plan of His redemption, in the arrangements of His providence, and in the requirements of His law, which the Scriptures enjoin. Yet, how often do we find persons who pretend to speculate about the mysteries of the Gospel, displaying, by their flippancy of speech respecting the eternal counsels of the Majesty of heaven—by their dogmatical assertions respecting the Divine character, and the dispensations of providence—and by their pertinacious opinions respecting the laws by which God *must* regulate His own actions—that they have never felt impressive emotions of the grandeur of that Being, whose "operations are unsearchable, and His ways past finding out?" Though they do not call in question His immensity and power, His wisdom and goodness, as so many abstract properties of His nature; yet the unbecoming familiarity with which they approach this august Being, and talk about Him, shows that they have never associated in their minds the stupendous displays which have been given of these perfections in the works of His hands; and that their religion (if it may be so called) consists merely in a farrago of abstract opinions, or in an empty name.

If, then, it be admitted, that it is essentially requisite, as the foundation of religion, to have the mind deeply impressed with a clear and comprehensive view of the natural perfections of the Deity, it will follow that the ministers of religion, and all others whose province it is to communicate religious instruction, ought frequently to dwell with particularity on those proofs and illustrations which tend to convey the most definite and impressive conceptions of the glory of that Being whom we profess to adore. But from what sources are such illustrations to be derived? Is it from abstract reasonings and metaphysical distinctions and definitions, or from a survey of those objects and movements which lie open to the inspection of every observer? There can be no difficulty in coming to a decision on this point. We might affirm with the schoolmen, that "God is a Being whose centre is every where, and His circumference no where;" that "He comprehends infinite duration in every moment," and that "infinite space may be considered as the *sensorium* of the Godhead;" but such fanciful illustrations, when strictly analyzed, will be found to consist merely of *words* without *ideas*. We might also affirm with truth, that God is a

Being of infinite perfection, glory, and blessedness—that He is without all bounds or limits, either actual or possible—that He is possessed of power sufficient to perform all things which do not imply a contradiction—that He is independent and self sufficient—that His wisdom is unerring, and that He infinitely exceeds all other beings. But these, and other expressions of a similar kind, are *mere technical terms* which convey no adequate, nor even tolerable notion of what they import. Beings, constituted like man, whose rational spirits are connected with an organical structure, and who derive all their knowledge through the medium of corporeal organs, can derive their clearest and most affecting notions of the Divinity chiefly through the same medium, namely, by contemplating the *effects* of His perfections as displayed through the ample range of the visible creation. And to this source of illustration the inspired writers uniformly direct our views:—"Lift up your eyes on high, and behold! who hath created these orbs? who bringeth forth their host by number, and calleth them all by their names? The everlasting God, the Lord, by the greatness of His might, for that He is strong in power." "He hath made the earth by His power; He hath established the world by His wisdom; He hath stretched out the heavens by His understanding." These writers do not perplex our minds by a multitude of technical terms and subtle reasonings; but lead us directly to the source whence our most ample conceptions of Deity are to be derived, that, from a steady and enlightened contemplation of the effects, we may learn the greatness of the Cause; and their example in this respect ought doubtless to be a pattern for every religious instructor.'

The following are the instances which our author adduces to illustrate the omnipotence of God:—

'The earth is a globe whose diameter is nearly 8,000 miles, and its circumference about 25,000, and consequently its surface contains nearly two hundred millions of square miles—a magnitude too great for the mind to take in at *one* conception. In order to form a tolerable conception of the whole, we must endeavor to take a leisurely survey of its different parts. Were we to take our station on the top of a mountain of a moderate size, and survey the surrounding landscape, we should perceive an extent of view stretching 40 miles in every direction, forming a circle 80 miles in diameter, and 250 in circumference, and comprehending an area of 5,000 square miles. In such a situation the terrestrial scene around and beneath us, consisting of hills and plains, towns and villages, rivers and lakes, would form one of the largest objects which the eye, and even the imagination, can steadily grasp at one time. But such an object, grand and extensive as it is, forms no more than the *forty thousandth part* of the terraqueous globe; so that before we can acquire an adequate conception of the magnitude of our own world, we must conceive 40,000 landscapes of a similar extent to pass in review before us: and were a scene, of the magnitude now stated, to pass before us every hour till all the diversified scenery of the earth were brought under our view, and were 12 hours a-day allotted for the observation, it would require 9 years and 48 days before the whole surface of the globe could be

contemplated, even in this *general* and *rapid* manner. But, such a variety of successive landscapes passing before the eye, even although it were possible to be realized, would convey only a very vague and imperfect conception of the scenery of our world; for objects at the distance of 40 miles cannot be distinctly perceived: the only view which would be satisfactory would be that which is comprehended within the range of three or four miles from the spectator.

Again: I have already stated, that the surface of the earth contains nearly 200,000,000 of square miles. Now, were a person to set out on a minute survey of the terraqueous globe, and to travel till he passed along every square mile on its surface, and to continue his route without intermission, at the rate of 30 miles every day, it would require 18,264 years before he could finish his tour, and complete the survey of "this huge rotundity on which we tread:" so that, had he commenced his excursion on the day in which Adam was created, and continued it to the present hour, he would not have accomplished one third part of this vast tour.

In estimating the size and extent of the earth, we ought also to take into consideration the vast variety of objects with which it is diversified, and the numerous animated beings with which it is stored;—the great divisions of land and water, the continents, seas, and islands, into which it is distributed; the lofty ranges of mountains which rear their heads to the clouds; the unfathomed abysses of the ocean; its vast subterraneous caverns and burning mountains; and the lakes, rivers, and stately forests with which it is so magnificently adorned; the many millions of animals, of every size and form, from the elephant to the mite, which traverse its surface; the numerous tribes of fishes, from the enormous whale to the diminutive shrimp, which "play" in the mighty ocean; the ærial tribes which sport in the regions above us, and the vast mass of the surrounding atmosphere, which encloses the earth and all its inhabitants as "with a swaddling band." The immense variety of beings with which our terrestrial habitation is furnished conspires, with every other consideration, to exalt our conceptions to that power, by which our globe, and all that it contains, were brought into existence.

The preceding illustrations, however, exhibit the vast extent of the earth considered only as a mere superficies. But we know that the earth is a solid globe, whose specific gravity is nearly five times denser than water, or about twice as dense as the mass of earth and rocks which compose its surface. Though we cannot dig into its bowels beyond a mile in perpendicular depth to explore its hidden wonders, yet we may easily conceive what a vast and indescribable mass of matter must be contained between the two opposite portions of its external circumference, reaching 8000 miles in every direction. The solid contents of this ponderous ball is no less than 263,858,149,120 cubical miles—a mass of material substance of which we can form but a very faint and imperfect conception—in proportion to which all the lofty mountains which rise above its surface are less than a few grains of sand, when compared with the largest artificial globe. Were the earth a hollow sphere, surrounded merely with an external shell of earth and water ten miles thick, its internal cavity would be sufficient to contain a quantity of materials *one hundred and thirty-three times*

greater than the whole mass of continents, islands, and oceans, on its surface, and the foundations on which they are supported. We have the strongest reasons, however, to conclude, that the earth, in its general structure, is one solid mass, from the surface to the centre, excepting, perhaps, a few caverns scattered here and there, amidst its subterraneous recesses: and that its density gradually increases from its surface to its central regions. What an enormous mass of materials, then, is comprehended within the limits of that globe on which we tread! The mind labors, as it were, to comprehend the mighty idea; and after all its exertion, feels itself unable to take in such an astonishing magnitude at *one* comprehensive grasp. How great must be the power of that Being who commanded it to spring from nothing into existence, who "measureth the ocean in the hollow of His hand, who weigheth the mountains in scales, and hangeth the earth upon nothing!"

It is essentially requisite, before proceeding to the survey of objects and magnitudes of a superior order, that we should endeavor, by such a train of thought as the preceding, to form some tolerable and clear conception of the bulk of the globe we inhabit; for it is the only body we can use as a standard of comparison to guide the mind in its conceptions, when it roams abroad to other regions of material existence. And from what has been now stated, it appears that we have no *adequate* conception of a magnitude of so vast an extent; or, at least, that the mind cannot, in any one instant, form to itself a distinct and comprehensive idea of it, in any measure corresponding to the reality.

Hitherto, then, we have fixed only on a determinate magnitude—on a scale of a few inches, as it were, in order to assist us in our measurement and conception of magnitudes still more august and astonishing. When we contemplate by the light of science those magnificent globes which float around us in the concave of the sky, the earth, with all its sublime scenery, stupendous as it is, dwindles into an inconsiderable ball. If we pass from our globe to some of the other bodies of the planetary system, we shall find that one of these stupendous orbs is more than 900 times the size of our world, and encircled with a ring 200,000 miles in diameter, which would nearly reach from the earth to the moon, and would enclose within its vast circumference several hundreds of worlds as large as ours. Another of these planetary bodies, which appears to the vulgar eye only as a brilliant speck on the vault of heaven, is found to be of such a size, that it would require 1,400 globes of the bulk of the earth to form one equal to it in dimensions. The whole of the bodies which compose the solar system (without taking the sun and the comets into account) contains a mass of matter 2,500 times greater than that of the earth. The sun himself is 520 times larger than all the planetary globes taken together; and one million, three hundred thousand times larger than the terraqueous globe. This is one of the most glorious and magnificent visible objects which either the eye or the imagination can contemplate; especially when we consider what perpetual, and incomprehensible, and powerful influence he exerts, what warmth, and beauty, and activity, he diffuses, not only on the globe we inhabit, but over the more extensive regions of surrounding worlds. His energy extends to the

utmost limits of the planetary system—to the planet Herschel, which revolves at the distance of 1,800 millions of miles from his surface, and there he dispenses light, and color, and comfort, to all the beings connected with that far-distant orb, and to all the moons which roll around it.

Here the imagination begins to be overpowered and bewildered in its conceptions of magnitude, when it has advanced scarcely a single step in its excursions through the material world: for it is highly probable that all the matter contained within the limits of the solar system, incomprehensible as its magnitude appears, bears a smaller proportion to the whole mass of the material universe than a single grain of sand to all the particles of matter contained in the body of the sun and his attending planets.

If we extend our views from the solar system to the starry heavens, we have to penetrate, in our imagination, a space which the swiftest ball that was ever projected, though in perpetual motion, would not traverse in ten hundred thousand years. In those trackless regions of immensity, we behold an assemblage of resplendent globes, similar to the sun in size, and in glory, and, doubtless, accompanied with a retinue of worlds, revolving, like our own, around their attractive influence. The immense distance at which the nearest stars are known to be placed, proves that they are bodies of a prodigious size, not inferior to our sun, and that they shine, not by reflected rays, but by their own native light. But bodies encircled with such refulgent splendor would be of little use in the economy of Jehovah's empire, unless surrounding worlds were cheered by their benign influence, and enlightened by their beams. Every star is, therefore, with good reason concluded to be a sun, no less spacious than ours, surrounded by a host of planetary globes, which revolve around it as a centre, and derive from it light, and heat, and comfort. Nearly a thousand of these luminaries may be seen in a clear winter night by the naked eye; so that a mass of matter equal to a thousand solar systems, or to *thirteen hundred and twenty millions of globes of the size of the earth*, may be perceived, by every common observer, in the canopy of heaven. But all the celestial orbs which are perceived by the unassisted sight do not form the eighty thousandth part of those which may be descried by the help of optical instruments. The telescope has enabled us to descry, in certain spaces of the heavens, thousands of stars where the naked eye could scarcely discern twenty. The late celebrated astronomer, Dr. Herschel, has informed us, that, in the most crowded parts of the milky-way, when exploring that region with his best glasses, he has had fields of view which contained no less than 588 stars, and these were continued for many minutes; so that "in one quarter of an hour's time there passed no less than *one hundred and sixteen thousand stars* through the field of view of his telescope."

It has been computed, that nearly *one hundred millions* of stars might be perceived by the most perfect instruments, were all the regions of the sky thoroughly explored. And yet, all this vast assemblage of suns and worlds, when compared with what lies beyond the utmost boundaries of human vision, in the immeasurable spaces of creation, may be no more than as the smallest particle of vapor to the immense ocean. Immeasurable regions of space lie beyond the utmost

limits of mortal view, into which even imagination itself can scarcely penetrate, and which are, doubtless, replenished with the operations of Divine wisdom and omnipotence. For, it cannot be supposed, that a being so diminutive as man, whose stature scarcely exceeds six feet—who vanishes from the sight at the distance of a league—whose whole habitation is invisible from the nearest star—whose powers of vision are so imperfect, and whose mental faculties are so limited—it cannot be supposed that man, who "dwells in tabernacles of clay, who is crushed before the moth," and chained down, by the force of gravitation, to the surface of a small planet—should be able to descry the utmost boundaries of the empire of Him who fills immensity, and dwells in "light unapproachable." That portion of his dominions, however, which lies within the range of our view, presents such a scene of magnificence and grandeur, as must fill the mind of every reflecting person with astonishment and reverence, and constrain him to exclaim, "Great is our Lord, and of great power, His understanding is infinite." "When I consider the heavens, the work of thy fingers, the moon and the stars which thou hast ordained—what is man that thou art mindful of him!" "I have heard of thee by hearing of the ear:" I have listened to subtle disquisitions on thy character and perfections, and have been but little affected, "but now mine eye *seeth* thee; wherefore I humble myself, and repent in dust and ashes."

In order to feel the full force of the impression made by such contemplations, the mind must pause at every step in its excursions through the boundless regions of material existence; for it is not by a mere attention to the figures and numbers by which the magnitudes of the great bodies of the universe are expressed that we arrive at the most distinct and ample conceptions of objects so grand and overwhelming. The mind, in its intellectual range, must dwell on every individual scene it contemplates, and on the various objects of which it is composed. It must add scene to scene, magnitude to magnitude, and compare smaller objects with greater—a range of mountains with the whole earth, the earth with the planet Jupiter, Jupiter with the sun, the sun with a thousand stars, a thousand stars with eighty millions, and eighty millions with all the boundless extent which lies beyond the limits of mortal vision; and at every step of this mental process sufficient time must be allowed for the imagination to expatiate on the objects before it, till the ideas approximate, as near as possible, to the reality. In order to form a comprehensive conception of the extent of the terraqueous globe, the mind must dwell on an extensive landscape, and the objects with which it is adorned; it must endeavor to survey the many thousands of diversified landscapes which the earth exhibits—the hills and plains, the lakes and rivers, and mountains, which stretch in endless variety over its surface; it must dive into the vast caverns of the ocean—penetrate into the subterraneous regions of the globe—and wing its way, amid clouds and tempests, through the surrounding atmosphere. It must next extend its flight through the most expansive regions of the solar system, realizing in imagination those magnificent scenes which can be descried neither by the naked eye nor by the telescope; and comparing the extent of our sublunary world with the more magnificent globes that roll around us. Leaving the sun, and all his attendant planets behind, till they have diminished

to the size of a small twinkling star, it must next wing its way to the starry regions, and pass from one system of worlds to another, from one nebulæ* to another, from one region of nebulæ to another, till it arrive at the utmost boundaries of creation which human genius has explored. It must also endeavor to extend its flight beyond all that is visible by the best telescopes, and expatiate at large in that boundless expanse into which no human eye has yet penetrated, and which is, doubtless, replenished with other worlds, and systems, and firmaments, where the operations of infinite power and beneficence are displayed in endless variety, throughout the illimitable regions of space.

Here, then, with reverence, let us pause and wonder! Over all this vast assemblage of material existence God presides. Amid the diversified objects and intelligences it contains, He is eternally and essentially present. By His unerring wisdom all its complicated movements are directed. By His almighty fiat it emerged from nothing into existence, and is continually supported from age to age. "HE SPAKE AND IT WAS DONE; HE COMMANDED AND IT STOOD FAST." "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the spirit of his mouth." What an astonishing display of Divine power is here exhibited to our view! How far transcending all finite comprehension must be the energies of Him who only "spake, and it was done;" who only gave the command, and this mighty system of the universe, with all its magnificence, started into being! The infinite ease with which this vast fabric was reared, leads us irresistibly to conclude, that there are powers and energies in the Divine mind which have never yet been exerted, and which may unfold themselves to intelligent beings, in the production of still more astonishing and magnificent effects, during an endless succession of existence. That man who is not impressed with a venerable and overwhelming sense of the power and majesty of Jehovah by such contemplations, must have a mind incapable of ardent religious emotions, and unqualified for appreciating the grandeur of that Being "whose kingdom ruleth over all." And shall such ennobling views be completely withheld from a Christian audience? Shall it be considered as a matter of mere indifference, whether their views of the Creator's works be limited to the sphere of a few miles around them, or extended to ten thousand worlds?—whether they shall be left to view the operations of the Almighty throughout eternity past and to come, as confined to a small globe placed in the immensity of space, with a number of brilliant studs fixed in the arch of heaven, at a few miles distance; or as extending through the boundless dimensions of space?—whether they shall be left to entertain no higher idea of the Divine majesty, than what may be due to one of the superior orders of the seraphim or cherubim,—or whether they shall be directed to form the most august conceptions of the King eternal, immortal, and invisible, corresponding to the displays He has given of His glory in His visible works? If it be not, both reason and piety require that such illustrations of the Divine perfections should occasionally be exhibited to their view.

In the next place, the *rapid motions* of the great bodies of the

* For an account of the nebulæ, see ch. ii, art. *Astronomy*.

universe, no less than their magnitudes, display the infinite power of the Creator.

We can acquire accurate ideas of the relative velocities of moving bodies only by comparing the motions with which we are familiar with one another, and with those which lie beyond the general range of our minute inspection. We can acquire a pretty accurate conception of the velocity of a ship, impelled by the wind—of a steam boat—of a race horse—of a bird darting through the air—of an arrow flying from a bow—and of the clouds when impelled by a stormy wind. The velocity of a ship is from 8 to 12 miles an hour—of a race horse, from 20 to 30 miles—of a bird, say from 50 to 60 miles—and of the clouds, in a violent hurricane, from 80 to 100 miles an hour. The motion of a ball from a loaded cannon is incomparably swifter than any of the motions now stated; but of the velocity of such a body we have a less accurate idea; because, its rapidity being so great, we cannot trace it distinctly by the eye through its whole range from the mouth of the cannon to the object against which it is impelled. By experiments it has been found that its rate of motion is from 480 to 800 miles in an hour; but it is retarded every moment by the resistance of the air and the attraction of the earth. This velocity, however, great as it is, bears no sensible proportion to the rate of motion which is found among the celestial orbs. That such enormous masses of matter should move at all is wonderful; but when we consider the amazing velocity with which they are impelled, we are lost in astonishment. The planet Jupiter, in describing his circuit round the sun, moves at the rate of 29,000 miles an hour. The planet Venus, one of the nearest and most brilliant of the celestial bodies, and about the same size as the earth, is found to move through the spaces of the firmament at the rate of 76,000 miles an hour; and the planet Mercury, with a velocity of no less than 150,000 miles an hour, or 1750 miles in a minute—a motion two hundred times swifter than that of a cannon ball.

These velocities will appear still more astonishing, if we consider the magnitude of the bodies which are thus impelled, and the immense forces which are requisite to carry them along in their courses. However rapidly a ball flies from the mouth of a cannon, it is the flight of a body only a *few inches* in diameter; but one of the bodies, whose motion has been just now stated, is *eighty-nine thousand miles* in diameter, and would comprehend within its vast circumference more than a thousand globes as large as the earth. Could we contemplate such motions from a fixed point, at the distance of only a few hundreds of miles from the bodies thus impelled, it would raise our admiration to its highest pitch—it would overwhelm all our faculties; and, in our present state, would produce an impression of awe, and even of terror, beyond the power of language to express. The earth contains a mass of matter equal in weight to at least 2,200,000,000,000,000,000,000 tons, supposing its mean density to be only about 2½ times greater than water. To move this ponderous mass a single inch beyond its position, were it fixed in a quiescent state, would require a mechanical force almost beyond the power of numbers to express. The physical force of all the myriads of intelligences within the bounds of the planetary system, though their powers were far superior to those of man,

would be altogether inadequate to the production of such a motion. How much more must be the force requisite to impel it with a velocity one hundred and forty times swifter than a cannon ball, or 68,000 miles an hour, the actual rate of its motion in its course round the sun! But, whatever degree of mechanical power would be requisite to produce such a stupendous effect, it would require a force one hundred and fifty times greater to impel the planet Jupiter in his actual course through the heavens! Even the planet Saturn, one of the slowest moving bodies of our system, a globe 900 times larger than the earth, is impelled through the regions of space at the rate of 22,000 miles an hour, carrying along with him two stupendous rings, and seven moons larger than ours, through his whole course round the central luminary. Were we placed within a thousand miles of this stupendous globe, (a station which superior beings may occasionally occupy,) where its hemisphere, encompassed by its magnificent rings, would fill the whole extent of our vision—the view of such a ponderous and glorious object, flying with such amazing velocity before us, would infinitely exceed every idea of grandeur we can derive from terrestrial scenes, and overwhelm our powers with astonishment and awe. Under such an emotion, we could only exclaim, "GREAT AND MARVELLOUS ARE THY WORKS, LORD GOD ALMIGHTY!" The ideas of *strength* and *power* implied in the impulsion of such enormous masses of matter, through the illimitable tracts of space, are forced upon the mind with irresistible energy, far surpassing what any abstract propositions or reasonings can convey; and constrain us to exclaim, "Who is a strong Lord like unto thee! Thy right hand is become glorious in power! The Lord God omnipotent reigneth!"

If we consider the *immense number* of bodies thus impelled through the vast spaces of the universe—the rapidity with which the *comets*, when near the sun, are carried through the regions they traverse,—if we consider the high probability, if not absolute certainty, that the sun, with all his attendant planets and comets, is impelled with a still greater degree of velocity toward some distant region of space, or around some wide circumference—that all the thousands of systems of that nebulæ, to which the sun belongs, are moving in a similar manner—that all the nebulæ in the heavens are moving around some magnificent central body—in short, that all the suns and worlds in the universe are in rapid and perpetual motion, as constituent portions of one grand and boundless empire, of which Jehovah is the Sovereign—and, if we consider still farther, that all these mighty movements have been going on, without intermission, during the course of many centuries, and some of them, perhaps, for myriads of ages before the foundations of our world were laid—it is impossible for the human mind to form any adequate idea of the stupendous forces which are in incessant operation throughout the unlimited empire of the Almighty. To estimate such mechanical force, even in a single instance, completely baffles the mathematician's skill, and sets the power of numbers at defiance. "Language," and figures, and comparisons, are "lost in wonders so sublime;" and the mind, overpowered with such reflections, is irresistibly led upward to search for the cause in that OMNIPOTENT BEING who upholds the pillars of the universe—the thunder of whose power none can comprehend. While contemplating such

august objects, how emphatic and impressive appears the language of the sacred oracles: "Canst thou, by searching, find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection? Great things doth He which we cannot comprehend. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the glory, and the majesty; for all that is in heaven and earth is thine. Among the gods there is none like unto thee, O Lord, neither are there any works like unto thy works. Thou art great, and dost wondrous things; thou art God alone. Hast thou not known, hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of all things, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding. Let all the earth fear the Lord, let all the inhabitants of the world stand in awe of Him; for He *spake*, and *it was done;* He commanded, and it stood fast."

Again: the *immense spaces* which surround the heavenly bodies, and in which they perform their revolutions, tend to expand our conceptions on this subject, and to illustrate the magnificence of the Divine operations. In whatever point of view we contemplate the scenery of the heavens, an idea of grandeur irresistibly bursts upon the mind; and if empty space can, in any sense, be considered as an object of sublimity, nothing can fill the mind with a grander idea of magnitude and extension than the amplitude of the scale on which planetary systems are constructed. Around the body of the sun there is allotted a cubical space, 3,600 millions of miles in diameter, in which eleven planetary globes revolve, every one being separated from another by intervals of many millions of miles. The space which surrounds the utmost limits of our system, extending in every direction to the nearest fixed stars, is, at least, 40,000,000,000,000 miles in diameter; and it is highly probable that every star is surrounded by a space of equal, or even of greater extent. A body impelled with the greatest velocity which art can produce—a cannon ball, for instance—would require twenty years to pass through the space that intervenes between the earth and the sun, and four millions, seven hundred thousand years ere it could reach the nearest star. Though the stars seem to be crowded together in clusters, and some of them almost to touch one another, yet the distance between any two stars which seem to make the nearest approach, is such as neither words can express, nor imagination fathom. These immense spaces are as unfathomable, on the one hand, as the magnitude of the bodies which move in them, and their prodigious velocities, are incomprehensible on the other; and they form a part of those magnificent proportions according to which the fabric of universal nature was arranged—all corresponding to the majesty of that infinite and incomprehensible Being, "who measures the ocean in the hollow of His hand, and meteth out the heavens with a span." How wonderful that bodies at such prodigious distances should exert a mutual influence on one another!—that the moon, at the distance of 240,000 miles, should raise tides in the ocean, and currents in the atmosphere!—that the sun, at the distance of ninety-five millions of miles, should raise the vapors, move the ocean, direct the course of the winds, fructify the earth, and distribute light, and heat, and color, through every region of the globe; yea, that his attractive influence, and fructifying energy, should extend even to the planet Herschel, at the distance of eighteen hundred millions of miles! So that, in every

point of view in which the universe is contemplated, we perceive the same *grand scale* of operation by which the Almighty has arranged the provinces of His universal kingdom.

We would now ask, in the name of all that is sacred, whether such magnificent manifestations of Deity ought to be considered as irrelevant in the business of religion; and whether they ought to be thrown completely into the shade, in the discussions which take place in religious topics, in "the assemblies of the saints?" If religion consists in the intellectual apprehension of the perfections of God, and in the moral effects produced by such an apprehension,—if all the rays of glory emitted by the luminaries of heaven, are only so many reflections of the grandeur of Him who dwells in light unapproachable,—if they have a tendency to assist the mind in forming its conceptions of that ineffable Being, whose uncreated glory cannot be directly contemplated,—and if they are calculated to produce a sublime and awful impression on all created intelligences,—shall we rest contented with a less glorious idea of God than His works are calculated to afford? Shall we disregard the works of the Lord, and contemn "the operations of His hands," and that, too, in the face of all the invitations on this subject, addressed to us from heaven? For thus saith Jehovah: "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold, who hath created these things, who bringeth forth their host by number,—I, the Lord, who maketh all things, who stretcheth forth the heavens alone, and spread abroad the earth by Himself; all their host have I commanded." And if, at the command of God, we lift up our eyes to the "firmament of His power," surely we ought to do it, not with a brute "unconscious gaze"—not with the vacant stare of a savage—not as if we were still enveloped with the mists and prejudices of the dark ages—but as surrounded by that blaze of light which modern science has thrown upon the scenery of the sky, in order that we may contemplate with fixed attention all that enlightened reason, aided by the nicest observations, has ascertained respecting the magnificence of the celestial orbs. To overlook the sublime discoveries of modern times, to despise them, or to call in question their reality, as some religionists have done, because they bring to our ears such astonishing reports of the "eternal power" and majesty of Jehovah, is to act as if we were afraid lest the Deity should be represented as more grand and magnificent than He really is, and as if we would be better pleased to pay Him a less share of homage and adoration than is due to His name.'

After adducing a variety of topics to illustrate the wisdom and intelligence of the Deity, such as the arrangement, velocity, and magnitude of the heavenly bodies, their general relations, and adaptation to each other, and to their uses, he has the following very appropriate remarks on the *variety of nature*:—

'As a striking evidence of Divine intelligence, we may next consider the *immense variety which the Creator has introduced into every department of the material world.*

In every region on the surface of the globe an endless multiplicity of objects, all differing from one another in shape, color, and motion,

present themselves to the view of the beholder. Mountains covered with forests, hills clothed with verdure, spacious plains adorned with vineyards, orchards, and waving grain; naked rocks, abrupt precipices, extended vales, deep dells, meandering rivers, roaring cataracts, brooks and rills; lakes and gulfs, bays and promontories, seas and oceans, caverns and grottoes—meet the eye of the student of nature, in every country, with a variety which is at once beautiful and majestic. Nothing can exceed the variety of the *vegetable kingdom*, which pervades all climates, and almost every portion of the dry land, and of the bed of the ocean. The immense collections of natural history which are to be seen in the Museum at Paris, show that botanists are already acquainted with nearly fifty-six thousand different species of plants. (*Edinburgh Philosophical Journal, July*, 1822, p. 48.) And yet, it is probable, that these form but a very small portion of what actually exists, and that several hundreds of thousands of species remains to be explored by the industry of future ages: for by far the greater part of the vegetable world still remains to be surveyed by the scientific botanist. Of the numerous tribes of vegetable nature which flourish in the interior of Africa and America, in the immense islands of New Holland, New Guinea, Borneo, Sumatra, Java, Ceylon, Madagascar, and Japan; in the vast regions of Tartary, Thibet, Siberia, and the Burman empire; in the Philippines, the Moluccas, the Ladrones, the Carolinas, the Marquesas, the Society, the Georgian, and in thousands of other islands which are scattered over the Indian and Pacific oceans —little or nothing is known by the naturalists of Europe; and yet it is a fact which admits of no dispute, that every country hitherto explored produces a variety of species of plants peculiar to itself; and those districts in Europe which have been frequently surveyed present to every succeeding explorer a new field of investigation, and reward his industry with new discoveries of the beauties and varieties of the vegetable kingdom. It has been conjectured by some naturalists, on the ground of a multitude of observations, that "there is not a square league of earth but what presents some one plant peculiar to itself, or, at least, which thrives there better, or appears more beautiful than in any other part of the world." This would make the number of species of vegetables to amount to as many millions as there are of square leagues on the surface of the earth.

Now every one of these species of plants differs from another, in its size, structure, form, flowers, leaves, fruits, mode of propagation, color, medicinal virtues, nutritious qualities, internal vessels, and the odors it exhales. They are of all sizes, from the microscopic mushroom, invisible to the naked eye, to the sturdy oak, and the cedar of Lebanon, and from the slender willow to the Banian tree, under whose shade 7000 persons may find ample room to repose. A thousand different shades of color distinguish the different species. Every one wears its peculiar livery, and is distinguished by its own native hues; and many of their inherent beauties can be distinguished only by the help of the microscope. Some grow upright, others creep along in a serpentine form. Some flourish for ages, others wither and decay in a few months; some spring up in moist, others in dry soils; some turn toward the sun, others shrink and contract when we approach to touch them. Not only are the different species of plants and flowers distin-

guished from each other by their different forms, but even the different individuals of the same species. In a bed of tulips or carnations, for example, there is scarcely a flower in which some difference may not be observed in its structure, size, or assemblage of colors; nor can any two flowers be found in which the shape and shades are exactly similar. Of all the hundred thousand millions of plants, trees, herbs, and flowers, with which our globe is variegated, there are not perhaps two individuals precisely alike in every point of view in which they may be contemplated; yea, there is not, perhaps, a single leaf in the forest, when minutely examined, that will not be found to differ in certain aspects from its fellows. Such is the wonderful and infinite diversity with which the Creator has adorned the vegetable kingdom.

His wisdom is also evidently displayed in this vast profusion of vegetable nature—in adapting each plant to the soil and situation in which it is destined to flourish—in furnishing it with those vessels by which it absorbs the air and moisture on which it feeds—and in adapting it to the nature and necessities of animated beings. As the earth teems with animated existence, and as the different tribes of animals depend chiefly on the productions of the vegetable kingdom for their subsistence, so there is an abundance and a variety of plants adapted to the peculiar constitutions of every individual species. This circumstance demonstrates that there is a pre-contrived relation and fitness between the internal *constitution* of the animal, and the *nature of the plants* which afford it nourishment; and shows us that the animal and vegetable kingdoms are the workmanship of *one* and the same almighty Being, and that, in his arrangements with regard to the one, He had in view the necessities of the other.

When we direct our attention to the tribes of *animated nature*, we behold a scene no less variegated and astonishing. Above fifty thousand species of animals have been detected and described by naturalists, beside several thousands of species which the naked eye cannot discern, and which people the invisible regions of the waters and the air. And, as the greater part of the globe has never yet been thoroughly explored, several hundreds, if not thousands, of species unknown to the scientific world may exist in the depths of the ocean, and in the unexplored regions of the land. All these species differ from one another in color, size, and shape—in the internal structure of their bodies—in the number of their sensitive organs, limbs, feet, joints, claws, wings, and fins—in their dispositions, faculties, movements, and modes of subsistence. They are of all sizes, from the mite and the gnat up to the elephant and the whale; and from the mite downward to those invisible animalculæ, a hundred thousand of which would not equal a grain of sand. Some fly through the atmosphere, some glide through the waters, others traverse the solid land. Some walk on two, some on four, some on twenty, and some on a hundred feet. Some have eyes furnished with two, some with eight, some with a hundred, and some with eight thousand distinct transparent globes, for the purpose of vision.*

* The *eyes* of beetles, silk-worms, flies, and several other kinds of insects, are among the most curious and wonderful productions of the God of nature. On the head of a fly are two large protuberances, one on each side; these constitute its organs of vision. The whole surface of these protuberances is covered with

Our astonishment at the variety which appears in the animal kingdom is still farther increased when we consider not only the diversities which are apparent in their external aspect, but also in their internal structure and organization. When we reflect on the thousands of movements, adjustments, adaptations, and compensations, which are requisite in order to the construction of an animal system, for enabling it to perform its intended functions; when we consider that every species of animals has a system of organization peculiar to itself, consisting of bones, joints, blood vessels, and muscular motions, differing in a variety of respects from those of any other species, and exactly adapted to its various necessities and modes of existence; and when we consider still farther the incomprehensibly delicate contrivances, and exquisite borings, polishings, claspings, and adaptations, which enter into the organization of an animated being ten thousand times less than a mite; and that the different species of these animals are likewise all differently organized from one another—we cannot but be struck with reverence and astonishment at the *intelligence* of that incomprehensible Being who arranged the organs of all the tribes of animated nature, who "breathed into them the breath of life," and who continually upholds them in all their movements!

Could we descend into the subterraneous apartments of the globe, and penetrate into those unknown recesses which lie toward its centre, we should doubtless behold a variegated scene of wonders, even in those dark and impenetrable regions. But all the labor and industry of man have not hitherto enabled him to penetrate farther into the bowels of the earth than the six thousandth part of its diameter; so that we must remain for ever ignorant of the immense caverns and masses of matter that may exist, and of the processes that may be going on about its central regions. In those regions, however, near the surface, which lie within the sphere of human inspection, we perceive a variety analogous to that which is displayed in the other departments of nature. Here we find substances of various kinds formed into strata or layers of different depths—earths, sand, gravel, marl, clay, sand-stone, free-

a multitude of small hemispheres, placed with the utmost regularity in rows, crossing each other in a kind of lattice work. These little hemispheres have each of them a minute transparent convex lens in the middle, each of which has a distinct branch of the optic nerve ministering to it; so that the different lenses may be considered as so many distinct eyes. Mr. Leeuwenhoek counted 6236 in the two eyes of a silk-worm, when in its *fly* state; 3180 in each eye of the beetle; and 8000 in the two eyes of a *common fly*. Mr. Hook reckoned 14,000 in the eyes of a *drone fly;* and, in one of the eyes of a *dragon fly*, there have been reckoned 13,500 of these lenses, and, consequently, in both eyes 27,000, every one of which is capable of forming a distinct image of any object, in the same manner as a common convex glass; so that there are 27,000 images formed on the retina of this little animal. Mr. Leeuwenhoek having prepared the eye of a fly for the purpose, placed it a little farther from his microscope than when he would examine an object, so as to leave a proper local distance between it and the lens of his microscope; and then looked through both, in the manner of a telescope, at the steeple of the church, which was 299 feet high, and 750 feet distant, and could plainly see through every little lens, the whole steeple inverted, though not larger than the point of a fine needle: and then, directing it to a neighboring house, saw through many of these little hemispheres, not only the front of the house, but also the doors and windows, and could discern distinctly whether the windows were open or shut. Such an exquisite piece of Divine mechanism transcends all human comprehension.

stone, marble, lime-stone, fossils, coals, peat, and similar materials. In these strata are found metals and minerals of various descriptions—salt, nitrate of potash, ammonia, sulphur, bitumen, platina, gold, silver, mercury, iron, lead, tin, copper, zinc, nickel, manganeze, cobalt, antimony, the diamond, rubies, sapphires, jaspers, emeralds, and a countless variety of other substances, of incalculable benefit to mankind. Some of these substances are so essentially requisite for the comfort of man, that, without them, he would soon degenerate into the savage state, and be deprived of all those arts which extend his knowledge, and which cheer and embellish the abodes of civilized life.

If we turn our eyes upward to the regions of the atmosphere, we may also behold a spectacle of variegated magnificence. Sometimes the sky is covered with sable clouds, or obscured with mists; at other times it is tinged with a variety of hues, by the rays of the rising or the setting sun. Sometimes it presents a pure azure, at other times it is diversified with strata of dappled clouds. At one time we behold the rainbow rearing its majestic arch, adorned with all the colors of light; at another, the aurora borealis illuminating the sky with its fantastic corruscations. At one time we behold the fiery meteor sweeping through the air; at another, we perceive the forked lightning darting from the clouds, and hear the thunders rolling through the sky. Sometimes the vault of heaven appears like a boundless desert, and at other times adorned with an innumerable host of stars, and with the moon "walking in brightness." In short, whether we direct our view to the vegetable or the animal tribes, to the atmosphere, the ocean, the mountains, the plains, or the subterranean recesses of the globe, we behold a scene of beauty, order, and *variety*, which astonishes and enraptures the contemplative mind, and constrains us to join in the devout exclamations of the psalmist, "*How manifold are thy works*, O Lord! In wisdom hast thou made them all; the earth is full of thy riches; so is the great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping, *innumerable*, both small and great beasts."

This countless variety of objects which appears throughout every department of our sublunary system, not only displays the depths of Divine wisdom, but also presents us with a faint idea of the *infinity* of the Creator, and of the *immense multiplicity of ideas and conceptions* which must have existed in the Eternal Mind, when the fabric of our globe, and its numerous tribes of inhabitants, were arranged and brought into existence. And, if every other world which floats in the immensity of space be diversified with a similar variety of existence, altogether different from ours, (as we have reason to believe, from the variety we already perceive, and from the boundless plans and conceptions of the Creator,) the human mind is lost and confounded when it attempts to form an idea of those endlessly diversified plans, conceptions, and views, which must have existed during an eternity past in the Divine mind. When we would attempt to enter into the conception of so vast and varied operations, we feel our own littleness, and the narrow limits of our feeble powers, and can only exclaim, with the Apostle Paul, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His counsels, and His ways of creation and providence past finding out!"

This characteristic of variety, which is stamped on all the works of

Omnipotence, is, doubtless, intended to gratify the principle of curiosity, and the love of novelty, which are implanted in the human breast; and thus to excite rational beings to the study and investigation of the works of the Creator, that therein they may behold the glory of the Divine character, and be stimulated to the exercise of love, admiration, and reverence. For as the records of revelation, and the dispensations of Providence, display to us the various aspects of the moral character of Deity, so the diversified phenomena, and the multiplicity of objects and operations which the scenery of nature exhibits, present to us a specimen of the *ideas*, as it were, of the Eternal Mind, in so far as they can be adumbrated by material objects, and exhibited to mortals, through the medium of corporeal organs.

To convey an adequate conception of the *number* of these ideas, as exhibited on the globe in which we live, would baffle the arithmetician's skill, and set his numbers at defiance. We may, however, assist our conceptions a little, by confining our attention to one department of nature; for example, the ANIMAL KINGDOM. The number of the different species of animals, taking into account those which are hitherto undiscovered, and those which are invisible to the naked eye, cannot be estimated at less than 300,000. In a human body there are reckoned about 446 muscles, in each of which, according to anatomists, there are, at least, 10 several intentions or due qualifications to be observed—its proper figure, its just magnitude, the right disposition of its several ends, upper and lower, the position of the whole, the insertion of its proper nerves, veins, arteries, &c, so that in the muscular system alone there are 4,460 several ends or aims to be attended to. The bones are reckoned to be in number about 245, and the distinct scopes or intentions of each of these are above 40; in all, about 9,800; so that the system of bones and muscles alone, without taking any other parts into consideration, amounts to above 14,000 different intentions or adaptations. If now, we suppose, that all the species of animals above stated are differently constructed, and taken one with another contain, at an average, a system of bones and muscles as numerous as in the human body, the number of species must be multiplied by the number of different aims or adaptations, and the product will amount to 4,200,000,000. If we were next to attend to the many thousands of blood vessels in an animal body, and the numerous ligaments, membranes, humors, and fluids of various descriptions—the skin, with its millions of pores, and every other part of an organical system, with the aims and intentions of each, we should have another sum of many hundreds of millions to be multiplied by the former product, in order to express the diversified ideas which enter into the construction of the animal world. And, if we still farther consider, that of the hundreds of millions of individuals belonging to each species, no two individuals exactly resemble each other—that all the myriads of vegetables with which the earth is covered are distinguished from each other by some one characteristic or another—and that every grain of sand contained in the mountains, and in the bed of the ocean, as shown by the microscope, discovers a different form and configuration from another—we are here presented with an *image* of the *infinity* of the *conceptions* of Him, in whose incomprehensible mind they all existed, during countless ages, before the universe was formed.

To overlook this amazing scene of Divine intelligence, or to consider it as beneath our notice, as some have done—if it be not the characteristic of impiety, is at least the mark of a weak and indiscriminating mind. The man who disregards the visible displays of infinite wisdom, or who neglects to investigate them when opportunity offers, acts as if he considered himself already possessed of a sufficient portion of intelligence, and stood in no need of sensible assistances to direct his conceptions of the Creator. Pride, and false conceptions of the nature and design of true religion, frequently lie at the foundation of all that indifference and neglect with which the visible works of God are treated, by those who make pretensions to a high degree of spiritual attainments. The truly pious man will trace, with wonder and delight, the footsteps of his Father and his God, wherever they appear in the variegated scene of creation around him, and will be filled with sorrow and contrition of heart, that, amid his excursions and solitary walks, he has so often disregarded the "works of the Lord, and the operation of His hands."

In fine, the variety which appears on the face of nature, not only enlarges our conceptions of infinite wisdom, but is also the foundation of all our discriminations and judgments as rational beings, and is of the most essential utility in the affairs of human society. Such is the variety of which the features of the human countenance are susceptible, that it is probable that no two individuals of all the millions of the race of Adam, that have existed since the beginning of time, would be found to resemble each other. We know no two human beings presently existing, however similar to each other, but may be distinguished either by their stature, their forms, or the features of their faces; and on the ground of this dissimilarity, the various wheels of the machine of society move onward without clashing or confusion. Had it been otherwise—had the faces of men, and their organs of speech, been cast exactly in the same mould, as would have been the case had the world been framed, according to the Epicurean system, by blind chance directing a concourse of atoms, it might have been as difficult to distinguish one human countenance from another, as to distinguish the eggs laid by the same hen, or the drops of water which trickle from the same orifice; and, consequently, society would have been thrown into a state of universal anarchy and confusion. Friends would not have been distinguished from enemies, villains from the good and honest, fathers from sons, the culprit from the innocent person, nor the branches of the same family from one another. And what a scene of perpetual confusion and disturbance would thus have been created! Frauds, thefts, robberies, murders, assassinations, forgeries, and injustice of all kinds, might have been daily committed without the least possibility of detection. Nay, were even the *variety of tones* in the human voice, peculiar to each person, to cease, and the *hand writing* of all men to become perfectly uniform, a multitude of distressing deceptions and perplexities would be produced in the domestic, civil, and commercial transactions of mankind. But the all-wise and beneficent Creator has prevented all such evils and inconveniencies, by the character of *variety* which He has impressed on the human species, and on all His works. By the peculiar features of his countenance every man may be distinguished in the light; by the tones of his voice he may be recognized

in the dark, or when he is separated from his fellows by an impenetrable partition; and his hand writing can attest his existence and individuality, when continents and oceans interpose between him and his relations, and be a witness of his sentiments and purposes to future generations.'

Like the industrious bee, which gathers its honey from every opening flower, Mr. Dick ranges through the whole field of human science, explores, so far as the lights of knowledge will conduct him, every part of the creation of God, to illustrate his subject, and to confirm the Christian in the devout sentiment, that all these things are

'but the varied God.'

It cannot be expected, however, that we should follow him in this short review through his entire circuit of natural and civil history, geography, astronomy, geology, natural philosophy, and chemistry, from each of which he deduces arguments from the undoubted facts which are developed by these several branches of science in favor of his general theme. We cannot withhold, however, from our readers the following instructive reflections on the study of the works of the Almighty as they are seen in the volume of natural history:—

'Thus it appears, that the universe extends to infinity on either hand; and that wherever matter exists, from the ponderous globes of heaven down to the invisible atom, there the almighty Creator has prepared habitations for countless orders of existence, from the seraph to the animalculæ, in order to demonstrate His boundless beneficence, and the infinite variety of modes by which He can diffuse happiness through the universal system.

"How sweet to muse upon His skill display'd!
Infinite skill! in all that He has made;
To trace in nature's most minute design
The signature and stamp of power Divine;
Contrivance exquisite, express'd with ease,
Where unassisted sight no beauty sees;
The shapely limb and lubricated joint,
Within the small dimensions of a point;
Muscle and nerve miraculously spun,
His mighty work who speaks, and it is done,
Th' invisible in things scarce seen reveal'd;
To whom an atom is an ample field."—*Cowper's Retirement.*

With regard to the *religious* tendency of the study of natural history, it may be remarked, that, as all the objects which it embraces are the *workmanship of God*, the delineations and descriptions of the natural historian must be considered as "the history of the operations of the Creator;" or, in other words, so far as the science extends, "the history of the Creator himself:" for the marks of His incessant agency, His power, wisdom, and beneficence are impressed on every object, however minute, throughout the three kingdoms of nature, and throughout every region of earth, air, and sky. As the Deity is invisible to mortal eyes, and cannot be directly contemplated by finite minds,

without some material medium of communication, there are but two mediums with which we are acquainted by which we can attain a knowledge of His nature and perfections. These are either the *facts* which have occurred in the course of His providential dispensations toward our race since the commencement of time, and the moral truths connected with them—or the facts which are displayed in the economy of nature. The first class of facts is recorded in the sacred history, and in the annals of nations; the second class is exhibited in the diversified objects and motions which appear throughout the system of the visible universe. The one may be termed the *moral history*, and the other the *natural history* of the operations of the Creator. It is obviously incumbent on every rational being to contemplate the Creator through both these mediums; for each of them conveys its distinct and peculiar revelations; and, consequently, our perception of Deity through the one medium does not supersede the necessity of our contemplating Him through the other. While, therefore, it is our duty to contemplate the perfections, the providence, and the agency of God, as displayed in the Scripture revelation, it is also incumbent upon us to trace His attributes in the system of nature, in order that we may be enabled to contemplate the eternal Jehovah *in every variety of aspect*, in which He has been pleased to exhibit himself, in the universe He has formed.

The visible creation may be considered as a permanent and sensible manifestation of Deity, intended every moment to present to our view the unceasing energies of Him "in whom we live and move." And if the train of our thoughts were directed in its proper channel, we would perceive God in every object and in every movement: we would behold Him operating in the whirlwind, and in the storm; in the subterraneous cavern, and in the depths of the ocean; in the gentle rain, and the refreshing breeze; in the rainbow, the fiery meteor, and the lightning's flash; in the splendors of the sun, and the majestic movements of the heavens; in the frisking of the lambs, the songs of birds, and the buzz of insects; in the circulation of our blood, the movements of our joints, the motion of our eyeballs, and in the rays of light which are continually darting from surrounding objects for the purposes of vision. For these, and ten thousand other agencies in the systems of nature, are nothing else but the voice of Deity, proclaiming to the sons of men in silent, but emphatic language, "Stand still, and consider the wonderful works of God!"

If, then, it be admitted, that the study of nature is the study of the Creator—to overlook the grand and beautiful scenery with which we are surrounded, or to undervalue any thing which Infinite Wisdom has formed, is to overlook and contemn the Creator Himself. Whatever God has thought proper to create, and to present to our view in the visible world, it becomes man to study and contemplate, that from thence he may derive motives to excite him to the exercise of reverence and adoration, of gratitude and praise. In so far as any individual is unacquainted with the various facts of the history of nature, in so far does he remain ignorant of the manifestations of Deity; for every object on the theatre of the universe exhibits His character and designs in a different point of view. He who sees God only as He displays Himself in His operations on the earth, but has never contemplated the firmament with the eye of reason, must be unacquainted with those

amazing energies of eternal power which are displayed in the stupendous fabric and movements of the orbs of heaven. He who sees God only in the general appearances of nature, but neglects to penetrate into His minute operations, must remain ignorant of those astonishing manifestations of Divine wisdom and skill which appear in the contrivances, adaptations, and functions of the animal and the vegetable kingdoms. For the more we know of the work, the more accurate and comprehensive will be our views of the Intelligence by whom it was designed; and the farther we carry our investigations of the works of God, the more admirable and astonishing will His plans and perfections appear.

In short, a devout contemplation of the works of nature tends to ennoble the human soul, and to dignify and exalt the affections. It inspires the mind with a relish of the beauty, the harmony, and order which subsist in the universe around us; it elevates the soul to the love and admiration of that Being who is the author of our comforts, and of all that is sublime and beneficent in creation, and excites us to join with all holy beings in the chorus of praise to the God and Father of all. For they

> "Whom nature's works can charm, with God Himself
> Hold converse, grow familiar day by day
> With His conceptions, act upon His plan,
> And form to His the relish of their souls."

The man who surveys the vast field of nature, with the eye of reason and devotion, will not only gain a more comprehensive view of that illimitable power which organized the universe, but will find his sources of enjoyment continually increased, and will feel an ardent desire after that glorious world, where the veil which now hides from our sight some of the grandest manifestations of Deity will be withdrawn, and the wonders of Omnipotence be displayed in all their splendor and perfection.

In conformity with these sentiments, we find the inspired writers, in numerous instances, calling our attention to the wonders of creating power and wisdom. In one of the first speeches in which the Almighty is introduced as addressing the sons of men, and the longest one in the Bible, (Job, chap. xxxviii, xxxix, xl, xli,) our attention is exclusively directed to the subjects of natural history;—the whole address having a reference to the economy of Divine wisdom in the arrangement of the world at its first creation—the wonders of the ocean, and of light and darkness—the phenomena of thunder and lightning, rain, hail, snow, frost, and other meteors in the atmosphere—the intellectual faculties of man, and the economy and instincts of quadrupeds, birds, fishes, and other tribes of animated existence. Indeed, the greater part of the sublime descriptions contained in the book of Job has a direct reference to the agency of God in the material creation, and to the course of His providence in relation to the different characters of men; and the reasonings of the different speakers in that sacred drama proceed on the supposition that their auditors were intimately acquainted with the varied appearances of nature, and their tendency to exhibit the character and perfections of the omnipotent Creator. We find the psalmist, in the 104th Psalm, employed in a devout de-

scription of similar objects, from the contemplation of which his mind is raised to adoring views of their almighty Author; and, from the whole of his survey, he deduces the following conclusions:—"How manifold are thy works, O Lord! *In wisdom* thou hast made them all! The earth is full of thy riches; so is this great and wide sea, wherein are things creeping innumerable, both small and great beasts. The glory of the Lord shall endure for ever; the Lord shall rejoice in all His works.* I will sing unto the Lord as long as I live; I will sing praises to my God while I have my being."

But, in order to enter into the spirit of such sublime reflections, we must not content ourselves with a superficial and cursory view of the objects and operations of nature; we must not think it sufficient to acquiesce in such vague propositions as these—"The glory of God is seen in every blade of grass, and every drop of water; all nature is full of wonders, from the dust of the earth to the stars of the firmament." We must study the works of creation with ardor, survey them with minute attention, and endeavor to acquire a *specific* and *comprehensive* knowledge of the Creator's designs. We must endeavor to acquire a knowledge of the particular modes, circumstances, contexture, configurations, adaptations, structure, functions, and relations of those objects in which benevolence and design conspicuously appear—in the animal and the vegetable world, in the ocean, the atmosphere, and the heavens—that the mind may be enabled to draw the conclusion with full conviction and intelligence, "*In wisdom thou hast made them all.*" The pointed interrogatories which Jehovah addressed to Job, evidently imply that Job had previously acquired an intimate acquaintance with the works of nature. It seems to be taken for granted, as a matter of course, that he made himself acquainted with the general range of facts in the visible creation; and the intention of the several questions presented to his consideration evidently was to impress him with a sense of his own impotency, and to lead him to the investigation of the wonders of creating power which he had formerly overlooked. The conclusion which the psalmist draws respecting the *wisdom* displayed throughout all the works of God, plainly intimates that he had made the different parts of nature the subject of minute examination, and of deep reflection; otherwise he could not have rationally deduced his conclusion, or felt those emotions which filled his mind with the pious rapture so beautifully expressed in that hymn of praise to the Creator of the world.

We have therefore reason to believe, from these and other instances, that pious men, "in the days of old," were much more accustomed than modern Christians to contemplate and admire the visible works

* The *glory* of the Lord, in this passage, denotes the display of His perfections in the material universe; and the declaration of the inspired writer plainly intimates that this display will continue *for ever*, and will remain as an object of unceasing contemplation to all intelligences, and as an eternal monument of His power and wisdom. For although the earth and the aerial heavens will be changed at the close of that dispensation of Providence which respects our world, yet the general frame of the universe, in its other parts, will remain substantially the same; and not only so, but will in all probability be perpetually increasing in magnitude and grandeur. And the change which will be affected in respect to the terraqueous globe and its appendages will be such, that Jehovah will have reason to "rejoice" in this, as well as in all His other works.

of the Lord; and it is surely much to be regretted, that we who enjoy so many superior means of information, and who have access to the brilliant discoveries of later and more enlightened times, should manifest so much disregard to "the works of Jehovah and the operations of His hands." To enable the common mass of Christians to enter into the spirit of this delightful study and *Christian duty* should, therefore, be one object of those periodical and other religious works which are put into their hands; so that they may be enabled, with vigor and intelligence, to form the pious resolution of Asaph, "I will meditate on all thy works, O Lord! and talk of thy doings." "I will utter abundantly the memory of thy great goodness, and tell of thy wondrous works."'

We conclude our extracts with some of the author's remarks on 'the relation which the inventions of human art bear to the objects of religion:'—

'In this chapter, I shall briefly notice a few philosophical and mechanical inventions which have an obvious bearing on religion, and on the general propagation of Christianity among the nations.

The first, and perhaps the most important of the inventions to which I allude, is the ART OF PRINTING. This art appears to have been invented (at least in Europe) about the year 1430, by one Laurentius, or Lawrence Kostor, a native of Haerlem, a town in Holland. As he was walking in a wood near the city, he began to cut some letters upon the rind of a beach tree, which, for the sake of gratifying his fancy, being impressed on paper, he printed one or two lines as a specimen for his grandchildren to follow. This having succeeded, he meditated greater things; and first of all, invented a more glutinous writing ink, because he found the common ink sunk and spread; and thus formed whole pages of wood, with letters cut upon them.* By the gradual improvement of this art, and its application to the diffusion of knowledge, a new era was formed in the annals of the human race, and in the progress of science, religion, and morals. To it we are chiefly indebted for our deliverance from ignorance and error, and for most of

* I am aware that the honor of this invention has been claimed by other cities beside Haerlem, particularly by Strasburg, and Mentz, a city of Germany; and by other individuals beside Laurentius, chiefly by one *Fust*, commonly called Dr. Faustus; by Schoeffer, and by Guttenberg. It appears that the art, with many of its implements, was stolen from Laurentius by one of his servants, whom he had bound by an oath to secrecy, who fled to Mentz, and first commenced the process of printing in that city. Here the art was improved by Fust and Schoeffer, by their invention of *metallic* instead of *wooden* types, which were first used. When Fust was in Paris, disposing of some Bibles he had printed, at the low price (as was then thought) of sixty crowns, the number, and the uniformity of the copies he possessed, created universal agitation and astonishment. Informations were given to the police against him as a magician, his lodgings were searched, and a great number of copies being found, they were seized. The red ink with which they were embellished was said to be his blood: it was seriously adjudged that he was in league with the devil; and if he had not fled from the city, most probably he would have shared the fate of those whom ignorant and superstitious judges, at that time, condemned for witchcraft! From this circumstance, let us learn to beware how we view the inventions of genius, and how we treat those whose ingenious contrivances may afterward be the means of enlightening and meliorating mankind.

those scientific discoveries and improvements in the arts which distinguish the period in which we live. Without its aid the reformation from popery could scarcely have been achieved; for, had the books of Luther, one of the first reformers, been multiplied by the slow process of hand writing and copying, they could never have been diffused to any extent; and the influence of bribery and of power might have been sufficient to have arrested their progress, or even to have erased their existence. But, being poured forth from the press in thousands at a time, they spread over the nations of Europe like an inundation, and with a rapidity which neither the authority of princes, nor the schemes of priests and cardinals, nor the bulls of popes, could counteract or suspend. To this noble invention it is owing that copies of the Bible have been multiplied to the extent of many millions—that ten thousands of them are to be found in every Protestant country—and that the poorest individual, who expresses a desire for it, may be furnished with the "word of life," which will guide him to a blessed immortality. That Divine light which is destined to illuminate every region of the globe, and to sanctify and reform men of all nations, and kindreds, and tongues, is accelerated in its movements, and directed in its course through the nations, by the invention of the art of printing; and ere long it will distribute among the inhabitants of every land the "law and the testimony of the Most High," to guide their steps to the regions of eternal bliss. In short, there is not a more powerful engine in the hands of Providence for diffusing the knowledge of the nature and will of the Deity, and for accomplishing the grand objects of revelation, than the art of multiplying books, and of conveying intelligence through the medium of the press. Were no such art in existence, we cannot conceive how an extensive and universal propagation of the doctrines of revelation could be effected, unless after the lapse of an indefinite number of ages. But, with the assistance of this invention, in its present improved state, the island of Great Britain alone, within less than a hundred years, could furnish a copy of the Scriptures to every inhabitant of the world, and would defray the expense of such an undertaking, with much more ease, and with a smaller sum, than were necessary to furnish the political warfare in which we were lately engaged.

These considerations teach us, that the ingenious inventions of the human mind are under the direction and control of the Governor of the world—are intimately connected with the accomplishment of the plan of His providence—and have a tendency, either directly or indirectly, to promote over every region of the earth the progress and extension of the kingdom of the Redeemer. They also show us from what small beginnings the most magnificent operations of the Divine economy may derive their origin. Who could have imagined that the simple circumstance of a person amusing himself by cutting a few letters on the bark of a tree, and impressing them on paper, was intimately connected with the mental illumination of mankind; and that the art which sprung from this casual process was destined to be the principal means of illuminating the nations, and of conveying to the ends of the earth "the salvation of our God?" But, "He who rules in the armies of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth," and who sees "the end from the beginning," overrules the most minute

movement of all His creatures, in subserviency to His ultimate designs, and shows Himself in this respect to be "wonderful in counsel, and excellent in working."

THE MARINER'S COMPASS.—Another invention which has an intimate relation to religion is *the Art of Navigation, and the invention of the Mariner's Compass.* Navigation is the art of conducting a ship through the sea from one port to another. This art was partly known and practised in the early ages of antiquity by the Phenicians, the Carthaginians, the Egyptians, the Romans, and other nations of Europe and Asia. But they had no guide to direct them in their voyages, except the sun in the day time, and the stars by night. When the sky was overcast with clouds they were thrown into alarms, and durst not venture to any great distance from the coast, lest they should be carried forward in a course opposite to that which they intended, or be driven against hidden rocks or unknown shores. The danger and difficulty of the navigation of the ancients on this account may be learned from the deliberations, the great preparations, and the alarms of Homer's heroes, when they were about to cross the Egean Sea, an extent of not more than one hundred and fifty miles; and the expedition of the Argonauts under Jason, across the sea of Marmora and the Euxine, to the island of Colchis, a distance of only four or five hundred miles, was viewed as a most wonderful exploit at which even the gods themselves were said to be amazed. The same thing appears from the narration we have in the Acts of the Apostles of Paul's voyage from Cesarea to Rome. "When," says Luke, "neither sun nor stars in many days appeared, and no small tempests lay on us, all hope that we should be saved was then taken away." Being deprived of these guides, they were tossed about in the Mediterranean, not knowing whether they were carried to north, south, east, or west. So that the voyages of antiquity consisted chiefly in creeping along the coast, and seldom venturing beyond sight of land. They could not therefore extend their excursions by sea to distant continents and nations; and hence the greater portion of the terraqueous globe and its inhabitants were to them altogether unknown. It was not before the invention of the *mariner's compass* that distant voyages could be undertaken, that extensive oceans could be traversed, and an intercourse carried on between remote continents and the islands of the ocean.

It is somewhat uncertain at what precise period this noble discovery was made; but it appears pretty evident that the mariner's compass was not commonly used in navigation before the year 1420, or only a few years before the invention of printing.* The loadstone in all ages was known to have the property of attracting iron; but its tendency to point toward the north and south seems to have been unnoticed till the

* The invention of the compass is usually ascribed to Falvio Gioia, of Amalfi, in Campania, about the year 1302; and the Italians are strenuous in supporting this claim. Others affirm that Marcus Paulus, a Venetian, having made a journey to China, brought back the invention with him in 1260. The French also lay claim to the honor of this invention, from the circumstance that all nations distinguish the *north* point of the card by a *fleur de lis;* and, with equal reason, the English have laid claim to the same honor, from the name *compass*, by which most nations have agreed to distinguish it. But, whoever were the inventors, or at whatever period this instrumeut was first constructed, it does not appear that it was brought into general use before the period mentioned in the text.

beginning of the twelfth century. About that time some curious persons seem to have amused themselves by making to swim, in a basin of water, a loadstone suspended on a piece of cork; and to have remarked, that, when left at liberty, one of its extremities pointed to the north. They had also remarked, that, when a piece of iron is rubbed against the loadstone, it acquires also the property of turning toward the north, and of attracting needles and filings of iron. From one experiment to another, they proceeded to lay a needle, touched with the magnet, on two small bits of straw floating on the water, and to observe that the needle invariably turned its point toward the north. The first use they seem to have made of these experiments was to impose upon simple people by the appearance of *magic*. For example, a hollow swan, or the figure of a mermaid, was made to swim in a basin of water, and to follow a knife with a bit of bread upon its point which had been previously rubbed on the loadstone. The experimenter convinced them of his power, by commanding, in this way, a needle laid on the surface of the water, to turn its point from the north to the east, or in any other direction. But some genuises, of more sublime and reflective powers of mind, seizing upon these hints, at last applied these experiments to the wants of navigation, and constructed an instrument, by the help of which the mariner can now direct his course to distant lands through the vast and pathless ocean.

In consequence of the discovery of this instrument, the coasts of almost every land on the surface of the globe have been explored, and a regular intercourse opened up between the remotest regions of the earth. Without the help of this noble invention, America, in all probability, would never have been discovered by the eastern nations—the vast continent of New-Holland—the numerous and interesting islands in the Indian and Pacific oceans—the isles of Japan, and other immense territories inhabited by human beings, would have remained as much unknown and unexplored as if they had never existed. And as the nations of Europe, and the western parts of Asia, were the sole depositaries of the records of revelation, they could never have conveyed the blessings of salvation to remote countries, and to unknown tribes of mankind, of whose existence they were entirely ignorant. Even although the whole terraqueous globe had been sketched out before them, in all its aspects and bearings, and ramifications of islands, continents, seas, and oceans, and the moral and political state of every tribe of its inhabitants displayed to view—without a guide to direct their course through the billows of the ocean, they could have afforded no light and no relief to cheer the distant nations "who sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death." Though the art of printing had been invented; though millions of Bibles were now prepared adequate to the supply of all the "kindreds of the heathen"—though ships in abundance were equipped for the enterprise, and thousands of missionaries ready to embark, and to devote their lives to the instruction of the pagan world—all would be of no avail—and the "salvation of God" could never be proclaimed to the ends of the world, unless they had a mariner's compass to guide their course through the trackless ocean.

In this invention, then, we behold a proof of the agency of Divine Providence in directing the efforts of human genius to subserve the most important designs, and contemplate a striking specimen of the

"manifold wisdom of God." When the pious and contemplative Israelite reflected on the declaration of the prophets, that "the glory of Jehovah would be revealed, and that all flesh would see it together," from the state of the arts which then existed he must have felt many difficulties in forming a conception of the *manner* in which such predictions could be realized. "The great and wide sea," now termed the Mediterranean, formed the boundary of his view, beyond which he was unable to penetrate. Of the continents, and "the isles afar off," and of the far more spacious oceans that lay between, he had no knowledge; and how "the ends of the earth" were to be reached, he could form no conception; and, in the midst of his perplexing thoughts, he could find no satisfaction only in the firm belief that "with God all things are possible." But now we are enabled not only to contemplate the grand designs of the Divine economy, but the principal means by which they shall all in due time be accomplished, in consequence of the progress of science and art, and of their consecration to the rearing and extension of the Christian Church.

The two inventions to which I have now adverted may, perhaps, be considered as among the most striking instances of the connection of human art with the objects of religion. But there are many other inventions which, at first view, do not appear to bear so near a relation to the progress of Christianity, and yet have an ultimate reference to some of its grand and interesting objects.

The Telescope.—We might be apt to think, on a slight view of the matter, that there can be no immediate relation between the grinding and polishing of an optic glass, and fitting two or more of them in a tube—and the enlargement of our views of the operation of the Eternal Mind. Yet the connection between these two objects, and the dependence of the latter upon the former, can be fairly demonstrated. The son of a spectacle-maker of Middleburg, in Holland, happening to amuse himself in his father's shop, by holding two glasses between his finger and his thumb, and varying their distance, perceived the weather-cock of the church spire opposite to him, much larger than ordinary, and apparently much nearer, and turned upside down. This new wonder exercised the amazement of the father: he adjusted two glasses on a board, rendering them movable at pleasure; and thus formed the first rude imitation of a perspective glass, by which distant objects are brought near to view. Galileo, a philosopher of Tuscany, hearing of the invention, set his mind to work in order to bring it to perfection. He fixed his glasses at the end of long organ pipes, and constructed a telescope, which he soon directed to different parts of the surrounding heavens. He discovered four moons revolving around the planet Jupiter—spots on the surface of the sun, and the rotation of that globe around its axis—mountains and valleys in the moon—and numbers of fixed stars where scarcely one was visible to the naked eye. These discoveries were made about the year 1610, a short time after the first invention of the telescope. Since that period this instrument has passed through various degrees of improvement, and by means of it celestial wonders have been explored in the distant spaces of the universe, which, in former times, were altogether concealed from mortal view. By the help of telescopes, combined with the art of measuring the distances and magnitudes of the heavenly bodies, our

views of the grandeur of the Almighty, of the plenitude of His power, and of the *extent* of His universal empire, are extended far beyond what could have been conceived in former ages. Our prospects of the range of the Divine operations are no longer confined within the limits of the world we inhabit,—we can now plainly perceive that the kingdom of God is not only "an everlasting dominion," but that it extends through the unlimited regions of space, comprehending within its vast circumference thousands of suns, and ten thousands of worlds, all ranged in majestic order, at immense distances from one another, and all supported and governed "by Him who rides on the heaven of heavens," whose greatness is unsearchable, and whose understanding is infinite.

The telescope has also demonstrated to us the *literal truth* of those Scriptural declarations which assert that the stars are "innumerable." Before the invention of this instrument, not more than about a thousand stars could be perceived by the unassisted eye in the clearest night. But this invention has unfolded to view not only thousands, but hundreds of thousands, and millions of those bright luminaries, which lie dispersed in every direction throughout the boundless dimensions of space. And the higher the magnifying powers of the telescope are, the more numerous those celestial orbs appear; leaving us no room to doubt, that countless myriads more lie hid in the distant regions of creation, far beyond the reach of the finest glasses that can be constructed by human skill, and which are known only to Him "who counts the number of the stars, and calls them by their names."

In short, the telescope may be considered as serving the purpose of a vehicle for conveying us to the distant regions of space. We would consider it as a wonderful achievement, could we transport ourselves two hundred thousand miles from the earth, in the direction of the moon, in order to take a nearer view of that celestial orb. But this instrument enables us to take a much nearer inspection of that planet, than if we had actually surmounted the force of gravitation, traversed the voids of space, and left the earth 230,000 miles behind us. For, supposing such a journey to be accomplished, we should still be ten thousand miles distant from the orb. But a telescope which magnifies objects 240 times, can carry our views within ONE thousand miles of the moon; and a telescope, such as Dr. Herschel's 40 feet reflector, which magnifies 6,000 times, would enable us to view the mountains and vales of the moon as if we were transported to a point about 40 miles from her surface.* We can view the magnificent system of the

* Though the highest magnifying power of Dr. Herschel's large telescope was estimated at six thousand times, yet it does not appear that the doctor ever applied this power with success, when viewing the moon and the planets. The deficiency of light, when using so high a power, would render the view of these objects less satisfactory than when viewed with a power of one or two thousand times. Still, it is quite certain, that if any portions of the moon's surface were viewed through an instrument of such a power, they would appear as *large*, (but *not nearly so bright and distinct*,) as if we were placed about 40 miles distant from that body. The enlargement of the angle of vision in this case, or the apparent distance at which the moon would be contemplated, is found by dividing the moon's distance—240,000 miles by 6000, the magnifying power of the telescope, which produces a quotient of 40—the number of miles at which the moon would appear to be placed from the eye of the observer. Dr. Herschel appears to have used the highest power of his telescopes only or chiefly when

planet Saturn, by means of this instrument, as distinctly as if we had performed a journey of eight hundred millions of miles in the direction of that globe, which, at the rate of 50 miles an hour, would require a period of more than eighteen hundred years to accomplish. By the telescope, we can contemplate the region of the fixed stars, their arrangement into systems, and their immense numbers, with the same distinctness and amplitude of view as if we had actually taken a flight of ten hundred thousand millions of miles into those unexplored and unexplorable regions, which could not be accomplished in several millions of years, though our motion were as rapid as a ball projected from a loaded cannon. We would justly consider it as a noble endowment for enabling us to take an extensive survey of the works of God, if we had the faculty of transporting ourselves to such immense distances from the sphere we now occupy; but, by means of the telescopic tube, we may take nearly the same ample views of the dominions of the Creator, without stirring a foot from the limits of our terrestrial abode. This instrument may therefore be considered as a providential gift, bestowed upon mankind, to serve, in the meantime, as a *temporary substitute* for those powers of rapid flight with which the seraphim are endowed, and for those superior faculties of motion with which man himself may be invested when he arrives at the summit of moral perfection.

The Microscope.—The *microscope* is another instrument, constructed on similar principles, which has greatly expanded our views of the "manifold wisdom of God." This instrument, which discovers to us small objects invisible to the naked eye, was invented soon after the invention and improvement of the telescope. By means of this optical contrivance we perceive a variety of wonders in almost every object in the animal, the vegetable, and the mineral kingdoms. We perceive that every particle of matter, however minute, has a determinate form—that the very scales of the skin of a haddock are all beautifully interwoven and variegated, like pieces of net-work, which no art can imitate—that the points of the prickles of vegetables, though magnified a thousand times, appear as sharp and well polished as to the naked eye—that every particle of the dust on the butterfly's wing is a beautiful and regularly-organized feather—that every hair of our head is a hollow tube, with bulbs and roots, furnished with a variety of threads or filaments—and that the pores in our skin, through which the sweat and perspiration flow, are so numerous and minute that a grain of sand would cover a hundred and twenty-five thousand of them. We perceive animated beings in certain liquids, so small, that fifty thousand of them would not equal the size of a mite; and yet each of these creatures is furnished with a mouth, eyes, stomach, blood-vessels, and other organs for the performance of animal functions. In a stagnant pool, which is covered with a greenish scum, during the summer months, every drop of the water is found to be a world teeming with thousands of inhabitants. The mouldy substance which usually adheres to damp bodies exhibits a forest of trees and plants, where the

viewing some very minute objects in the regions of the stars. The powers he generally used, and with which he made most of his discoveries, were 227, 460, 754, 932, and occasionally 2010, 3168, and 6450, when inspecting double and treble stars, and the more distant nebulæ.

branches, leaves, and fruit can be plainly distinguished. In a word, by this admirable instrument we behold the same Almighty Hand which rounded the spacious globe on which we live, and the huge masses of the planetary orbs, and directs them in their rapid motions through the sky, employed, at the same moment, in rounding and polishing ten thousand minute transparent globes in the eye of a fly—and boring and arranging veins and arteries, and forming and clasping joints and claws, for the movements of a mite! We thus learn the admirable and astonishing effects of the wisdom of God, and that the Divine care and benevolence are as much displayed in the construction of the smallest insect, as in the elephant, or the whale, or in those ponderous globes which roll around us in the sky. These, and thousands of other views which the microscope exhibits, would never have been displayed to the human mind, had they not been opened up by this admirable invention.

In fine, by means of the two instruments to which I have now adverted, we behold Jehovah's empire extending to infinity on either hand. By the telescope we are presented with the most astonishing displays of His *omnipotence*, in the immense number, the rapid motions, and the inconceivable magnitude of the celestial globes; and, by the microscope, we behold, what is still more inconceivable, a display of His unsearchable wisdom in the Divine mechanism, by which a drop of water is peopled with myriads of inhabitants—a fact, which, were it not subject to ocular demonstration, would far exceed the limits of human conception or belief. We have thus the most striking and sensible evidence, that, from the immeasurable luminaries of heaven, and from the loftiest seraph that stands before the throne of God, down to this lower world, and to the smallest microscopic animalcula that eludes the finest glass, *He* is every where present—and by His power, intelligence, and agency, animates, supports, and directs the whole! Such views and contemplations naturally lead us to advert to the character of God as delineated by the sacred writers, that "He is of great power, and mighty in strength;" that "His understanding is infinite;" that "His works are wonderful;" that "His operations are unsearchable, and past finding out;" and they must excite the devout mind to join with fervor in the language of adoration and praise:—

> When thy amazing works, O God!
> My mental eye surveys,
> Transported with the view, I'm lost
> In wonder, love, and praise!

Steam Navigation.—We might have been apt to suppose that the chemical experiments that were first made to demonstrate the force of *steam*, as a mechanical agent, could have little relation to the objects of religion, or even to the comfort of human life and society. Yet it has now been applied to the impelling of ships and large boats along rivers and seas, in opposition to both wind and tide, and with a velocity which, at an average, exceeds that of any other conveyance. We have no reason to believe that this invention has hitherto approximated to a state of perfection: it is yet in its infancy; and may be susceptible of such improvements, both in point of expedition and of safety, as may render it the most comfortable and speedy conveyance between

distant lands for transporting the volume of inspiration, and the heralds of the Gospel of peace to "the ends of the earth." By the help of his compass the mariner is enabled to steer his course in the midst of the ocean, in the most cloudy days, and in the darkest nights, and to transport his vessel from one end of the world to another. It now only remains that navigation be rendered safe, uniform, and expeditious, and not dependent on adverse winds, or the currents of the ocean; and perhaps the art of propelling vessels by the force of steam, when arrived at perfection, may effectuate those desirable purposes. Even at present, as the invention now stands, were a vessel fitted to encounter the waves of the Atlantic, constructed of a proper figure and curvature, having a proper disposition of her wheels, and having such a description of fuel, as could be easily stowed, and in sufficient quantity for the voyage—at the rate of ten miles an hour, she could pass from the shores of Britain to the coast of America, in less than thirteen days;—and even at eight miles an hour, the voyage could be completed in little more than fifteen days; so that intelligence might pass and repass between the eastern and western continents within the space of a single month—a space of time very little more than was requisite, sixty years ago, for conveying intelligence between Glasgow and London. The greatest distance at which any two places on the globe lie from each other is about 12,500 miles; and, therefore, if a direct portion of water intervene between them, this space could be traversed in fifty-four or sixty days. And if the isthmus of Panama, which connects North and South America, and the isthmus Suez, which separates the Mediterranean from the Red Sea, were cut into wide and deep canals, (which we have no doubt will be accomplished as soon as civilized nations have access to perform operations in these territories,) every country in the world could then be reached from Europe in nearly a direct line, or at most by a gentle curve, instead of the long, and dangerous, and circuitous route which must now be taken, in sailing the eastern parts of Asia, and the north-western shores of America. By this means eight or nine thousand miles of sailing would be saved in a voyage from England to Nootka Sound, or the Peninsula of California; and more than six thousand miles in passing from London to Bombay in the East Indies; and few places on the earth would be farther distant from each other by water than 15,000 miles, which space might be traversed, at the rate mentioned above, in a period from sixty-two to seventy-seven days.

But we have reason to believe, that when this invention, combined with other mechanical assistances, shall approximate nearer to perfection, a much more rapid rate of motion will be effected; and the advantages of this, in a religious, as well as in a commercial point of view, may be easily appreciated; especially at the present period, when the Christian world, now aroused from their slumbers, have formed the grand design of sending a Bible to every inhabitant of the globe! When the empire of the prince of darkness shall be shaken throughout all its dependencies, and the nations aroused to inquire after light, and liberty, and Divine knowledge, intelligence would thus be rapidly communicated over every region, and between the most distant tribes. "Many would run to and fro, and knowledge would be increased." The ambassadors of the Redeemer, with the oracles of Heaven in

their hands, and the words of salvation in their mouths, would quickly be transported to every clime, "having the everlasting Gospel to preach to every nation, and kindred, and tongue, and people."'

Though we cannot assent to the justness of all Mr. Dick's conclusions, his book is worthy of a serious perusal. To meditate upon the works of God, as they exist in the natural world, and upon the displays of human skill in the various and useful inventions of man's ever active mind, must have a tendency, if directed in our contemplations by a suitable frame of mind, to fill us with wonder and amazement at those manifestations of Almighty power, wisdom, and goodness. And more especially is this effect produced when the volume of Divine revelation pours its enlightening rays upon the understanding. For though we, who live under this bright sun of truth, may not need the 'lesser light' to conduct us to 'glory and immortality,' yet following the rays of that celestial luminary, we are enabled more accurately to survey the splendid mansion which has been fitted up for our residence—to estimate the value, the utility, and the beauty of its furniture—and to enjoy, with the more exquisite relish, the rich provision which He has made for our support and comfort. Taking this light along with us, we may minutely examine all its apartments, analyze the materials of which it is composed, and survey, with pious awe and gratitude, the several rooms our heavenly Father has fitted up for our accommodation.

This same bright luminary will, moreover, conduct us to a believing view of that mansion which 'is eternal in the heavens,' as the future residence of the saints of the Most High God, and teach them that this is but their temporary home—a home, in which they are to fit themselves for that 'temple not made with hands,' where there is 'no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it; for the glory of God doth enlighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof.' And we certainly cannot breathe a more acceptable prayer into the ears of our common Father in heaven, than that all our readers may so use the gifts of an ever-bountiful Providence, while they dwell in this lower mansion, as to be fully prepared, by having their 'robes washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb,' to occupy some humble seat in that upper temple, 'where there is fulness of joy, and pleasures for evermore.'

MEMOIRS OF HANNAH MORE.

Memoirs of the Life and Correspondence of Mrs. Hannah More. *By* WILLIAM ROBERTS, Esq. 2 vols. 8vo. Harper and Brothers.

No subject of biography has occurred of late years so calculated to occupy and engross the attention, alike of the religious and literary world, as that of Hannah More. No author, who has attained an equal reputation, was ever more intimately connected, by purity of principles, by evangelical labors, by the wide and salutary influence of her writings, with the one—and by the first offsprings of her mind, the illustrious associates of her youth, and her early and brilliant reputation, with the other. With both religion and literature she has become identified. Her fine mind—her lofty talents—the energy and enthusiasm of her poetical temperament, made her known and admired, when the brightest names that ever England knew were in the zenith of their fame;—while that solemnity of character, which gradually weaned all the energies of her mind from the mere frivolities of imagination, and which eventually led her to consecrate them, in all their vigor and freshness, to the service of her Maker, has made her after life one of the greatest monuments of good, and one of the most exemplary instances of the triumph of religion, we have on record,—rendering those abilities, which otherwise would have proved merely *ornamental*—or would have been considered to have best subserved their purpose had they been deemed adequate, in the flowery paths of fiction,

'To point a moral, or adorn a tale—'

a mighty means of assisting the moral advancement of the age—and a source of permanent—of immortal benefit to her kind.

Though but lately dead, the reputation of Hannah More had long assumed that durable form which it will be destined to retain in the estimation of posterity. Her rank among the leading characters of her age had been permanently assigned her by public opinion;—and ere the close of her protracted life, she had enjoyed that, to an author, rarely accorded felicity, of knowing that her labors had been appreciated by the world as she wished them; and that the future had nothing of panegyric in store for her, which her cotemporaries had not freely awarded to the design and effect of her writings.

No work, then, has been looked for with more anxiety, and with greater expectation by the public, for several years, than these memoirs. It was rightly deemed that her life, when it should be written, would contain more to interest the great mass of the community than any similar book which had been published for a length of time. Those interested in the progress of the Gospel, and all who had derived benefit from the pure precepts and Christian morality of her writings, longed to trace the causes which had led a mind so calculated to win the world's proudest applause, and to be captivated with its admiration—to forsake the tempting paths of such glittering fame for the narrow road of the cross—and the more difficult, less inviting, and less dazzling purpose of improving her sex and species, by the inculcation of

the Divine morality of her Savior. A common and more solemn interest was likewise felt to know the effect of that eloquent religion upon her own character, and the influence which those sacred principles, she so well described, had in comforting her own heart—in cheering her own solitary life—and supporting her soul in the last moments of life.

We presume to say, from a perusal of these volumes, that all who looked for them, no matter with what high raised hopes, will be gratified beyond their expectations,—not from any ability on the part of the biographer—for seldom have we seen a work where insipidity and incompetence, on the part of an editor, have had so much effect in marring the general interest. But the materials of which these volumes are composed are beyond the reach of dullness; and are rich beyond most that have been published in this century, in vivid and authentic notices of the brilliant society of that Augustan age of British literature—

'When Reynolds painted, and when Goldsmith sung—'

now, indeed, passed away for ever; but which has left a record behind of more enduring and fascinating interest than any other intellectual era in the world. These volumes too contain a picture, one of the most powerful and beautiful that ever was drawn, of the influence of religion in the nurture and direction of faculties of the highest order, and impart much invaluable information as to the state of society in England, when that society was in the incipient stages of the onward progress of *heart* amelioration which marks our era. We can see the light of knowledge—the blessings of education—brought into contact with the palpable darkness of intellect, and mark its early effect; and, above all, we can see the elevated, the incalculable benefit, which one leading spirit, properly directed, may confer upon mankind—illuminating its own age with a light reflected from the brightness of God's eternal principles, and kindling up a beacon flame to guide the wandering reason of other times, inextinguishable in its strength and immortal in its duration.

Let us review, then, the life of this great author, and Christian lady. Though we cannot attempt any thing like a detailed account, yet the subject is so replete with instruction, and will present, as we advance, so much of elevated entertainment, that it cannot fail to be interesting.

Hannah More, the youngest but one of five sisters, was born in 1745—a memorable year in British domestic history. Jacob More, her father, was an educated man of good understanding, and strong natural sense. To his early instruction and assiduous pains we may attribute much of that stability of character which distinguished his eminent daughter,—another lesson, if another were wanting to parents, of the vital importance with which every moment's attention is fraught with regard to the future character and destiny of a child. She early displayed a precocity of disposition; and we are told, that 'her nurse, a pious old woman, had lived in the family of Dryden, whose son she had attended in his last illness—and the inquisitive mind of the little Hannah was continually prompting her to ask for stories about the poet;' an anecdote, which, though of little importance, is still curious, as evidencing the intellectual and imaginative cast of mind which could lead a child, at such an early age, to feel interested in the

personal history of an eminent poet. From her father little Hannah acquired a knowledge of the Latin and French languages, beside an excellent English education. She early developed that taste for holding the pen, which she afterward turned to such account.

The following trait of her infancy strongly reminds us of a similar propensity told with so much liveliness by Madame D'Arblay of herself. So well has Wordsworth called

'The child the father of the man.'

'In her days of infancy, when she could possess herself of a scrap of paper, her delight was to scribble upon it some essay or poem, with some well-directed moral, which was afterward secreted in a dark corner where the servant kept her brushes and dusters. Her little sister, with whom she slept, was usually the repository of her nightly effusions; who, in her zeal lest these compositions should be lost, would sometimes steal down to procure a light, and commit them to the first scrap of paper which she could find. Among the characteristic sports of Hannah's childhood, which their mother was fond of recording, we are told, that she was wont to make a carriage of a chair, and then to call her sisters to ride with her to London to see bishops and booksellers; an intercourse which we shall hereafter show to have been realized. The greatest wish her imagination could frame, when her scraps of paper were exhausted, was, that she might one day be rich enough to have a whole quire to herself; and when, by her mother's indulgence, the prize was obtained, it was soon filled with suppositious letters to depraved characters, to reclaim them from their errors, and letters in return expressive of contrition and resolutions of amendment.'

Respecting her adolescence few details are given. She made acquaintance of the elder Sheridan, (father of the statesman,) Ferguson the astronomer, Dr. Stonehouse, and Langhorne the poet and translator of Plutarch—between whom and the young poetess a correspondence commenced, of which several sprightly letters from Langhorne are given. Miss More's preference of a single life arose (a circumstance unknown until the publication of these volumes) from an unprofitable attachment which she formed in her twenty-second year, and of which some curious particulars are given. As our limits, however, are confined, we must refer our readers for particulars to the work, page 28 et seq. Up to this period of her life, she had been engaged with her sisters in the management of an extensive and lucrative school in Bristol; and though, at the age of seventeen, she had published her 'Search after Happiness,' she was as yet but little known, and comparatively obscure.

We have now to follow her to the metropolis of England, mingling in its brightest and most intellectual circles—yet unseduced by pleasure, and unawed by timidity—there laying the foundation of her future fame, and ushering her first productions into the world, under the surveillance, and cheered by the admiration and applause of men, who stood the mightiest in their own age, and whose equals it would be difficult to find in any.

As this period of her history is of great importance in its bearing upon her future life, and as it is of unrivalled interest in an abstract

point of view, as a piece of literary history, admitting us at once and by an untravelled path to the living society which Boswell and D'Arblay have described so vividly, and of which impatient curiosity can never have details too copious, we will enlarge a little on it; giving our readers an idea of the treasures of such information which this work contains.

Hannah More was almost the last living link that bound our age with that time of unequalled greatness, when England could boast of men more distinguished in every walk of literature and art, than she had ever known before; and from our knowledge of the capabilities of the human mind we may predict, than she will ever know again.

The age of Burke and Johnson will ever have a peculiar attraction for subsequent times, extrinsic if not independent of the glories of the great men who adorned it. Other periods in English history—the age of Elizabeth, as represented by the genius of Shakspeare, of Johnson, of Bacon, of Cecil; or that of Anne, illustrious by the victories of Marlborough, and the unequalled abilities of Pope and Addison, Swift, Bolingbroke, Berkeley, and a host of others—may contest with it in splendor of intellectual greatness, as they far exceed it in the magnitude of political performance. But neither these nor any similar era in foreign history have established such a household acquaintance with the heart. The admiration of enthusiastic contemporaries has transmitted to us a thousand social recollections of the time, which have become organized in our memory with its history, and the zeal of affectionate biographers has preserved in a thousand enchanting pictures of still glowing freshness the character and enjoyments of its domestic life. In the faithful pages of Boswell, the great moralist of his time still lives to instruct and delight us. We can see the immortal Burke—whose indignant eloquence night after night made the old walls of St. Stephen's tremble with anathemas against colonial tyranny—unbend his giant mind in the playful expansion of the social hour; we can still laugh at the pregnant jest of Goldsmith, admire the learning of Porson, and the acumen of Malone;—a thousand charming traits of private life give a zest and interest to those imperishable labors of the head, which the luminaries of this age have transmitted to the admiration of posterity, in common with (in this repect) their less fortunate predecessors. We may hold the Spectator, as a classic, superior to the Rambler; and the poetry of Pope may have a higher fame than the simple strains of Goldsmith; but of these men we know little beyond their writings. We have never seen them at the evening board, and we cannot blend our admiration for the author with our feelings for the man. Hence the period of which we speak will never lose the greenness of its attractions, and will be still entwined in our admiration with the warmest feelings of the heart.

But even had it not this, its own pre-eminence, the age of Johnson will ever have a place in the Christian's regard, second only to that in which the darkness and terrors of prevailing superstition were braved to the death by the dauntless spirits of the early reformers, or to that in the time of our Puritan fathers—when Gospel truth was the regulator of opinion, Gospel purity the rule of life; and when the doctrines of the New Testament attained perhaps a greater supremacy throughout a nation, than the world has since seen. In spite of political

profligacy and party distractions, it was an age of public morality; and in matters of religion—if not of practical piety, at least of national decency. The memorable labors of Wesley and his enthusiastic coadjutors were in successful operation: the neglected doctrines of regeneration and of practical holiness had awoke the slumbering echoes of the Gothic minsters of the establishment, and been thundered in the nation's ear from the highways and the fields: a spirit of inquiry, of searching truth, was abroad; and the leading dignitaries and clergy of the Church had become sensible that the tenor of their lives and preaching alone must silence innovation: the dissenters had been stirred up to fresh zeal and to greater holiness; and among all classes that mighty reaction was in progress, and may be traced in its incipient stage, which has placed the line of demarkation broad and deep between this age and all which have preceded it. We are perhaps wandering from our subject; but our remarks are incidental to it, and may be forgiven. The ways of God are plain, and the instruments by which He works not the favored ones of earth; and no force of prejudice can deny, and no enthusiasm of predilection hasten the conviction, that John Wesley's preaching, the unexampled success which attended his labors, and the leavening influence of practical religion, preserved through good and evil report, and acting upon the public mind in a thousand rays of secret but surely operating influence, has been the main cause of the evangelical character of our time; the salient principle to which may be traced, even more particularly in this country than in England, the greater sway which the principles and precepts of Christianity has in our generation as compared with all those which have preceded it.

These remarks over, and we proceed to our subject. The society of London, at the time Hannah More was introduced to it, was in the zenith of its excellence. Johnson, in the full plenitude of his reputation, was the oracle of every circle; Burke, by the might and majesty of his own unrivalled powers, had won his well-contested way to the highest point in the public estimation; Garrick, who never was equalled for perfection of dramatic representation and for truth of poetical conception,

'Was still the star of giddy fashion's throng;'

Sir Joshua Reynolds, the first portrait painter of his age, nightly attracted to his splendid residence all the leading characters of the day; Mrs. Montagu led the highest society by her magnificence, and captivated it by her sprightly wit; the brilliant genius of Sheridan was then in its early brightness; and the amiable Percy, the accomplished Mrs. Chapone, so well known by her excellent letters on female education, with many others, alike eminent in literature or politics, might be met from night to night in the saloons of that great metropolis, or attracted the daily notice of society by their reputation in their respective spheres. It is not therefore to be wondered at that a young female, sensitive, enthusiastic, and warm-hearted, on being transferred at once from the seclusion of domestic life to society so select, and so calculated to dazzle and fascinate the mind, should have been carried away by her impulses, and have resigned herself without thought and without hesitation to the pleasurable excitement that awaited her.—Accordingly we find Hannah More and her sisters indulging them-

selves without restraint in all the gayeties of the great metropolis; and their letters at this period bespeak the careless animation of their feelings. In these gay effusions, when the life of the future reformer of her sex was one ceaseless round of the pleasures of society, we can find but little trace of that stern morality which in after times distinguished the 'Thoughts on the Manners of the Great.' Yet though her heart was as yet unregenerated, there was still that tinge of seriousness in her character, which, when left to its own free operation, soon brought back her wandering and captivated reason to the strict path of rectitude. This vein can at times be distinctly traced in her most sprightly effusions; and there can be no doubt that when the authoress of the successful 'Percy' was receiving the compliments of the great, the witty, and the learned; and when 'old Drury's walls' night after night were ringing forth applauses on her youthful genius, her heart, far from being satisfied with the empty honor, retired within itself trembling with misgivings; and was but ill at ease beneath the whisperings of that still small voice of conscience which soon after made her renounce the theatre entirely, and with all her eloquence proscribe its pleasures. When in London Miss More principally resided in the house of Garrick, whose friendship for her was extreme. While there, her strong and imaginative mind, taking the natural direction of the place, laid the plan of her tragedy of Percy, which she finished in the course of the year; and which was afterward produced with very great success, under Garrick's direction, at Covent Garden theatre. While in the house of this celebrated man, the time of Miss More was spent in the ceaseless enjoyment of all the fashionable elegancies of the day; and if we were to judge by the rules then, as still existing in the world, we might suppose that her lot was more highly favored, and her happiness the most enviable that could have fallen to the lot of youth. Young, fascinating, accomplished, and successful; admired by those whose praise might well be deemed an honor: it speaks highly for the natural stability of her character that it did not degenerate into frivolity by the brilliant temptations of her situation. Indeed, with all her dissipation, she contrived to improve the high intellectual advantages which this state of intercourse with the London world afforded, with a diligence which few but herself could have blended with such incessant gayety. In the lively style which characterizes her correspondence at this time, she says,—'Would you believe it? In the midst of all the pomps and vanities of this wicked town, I have taken it into my head to study like a dragon; I read four or five hours every day, and wrote ten hours yesterday. How long this will last I do not know; but I fear no longer than the bad weather.'

We must insert the anecdote which follows, as giving a curious and lamentable picture of the Scriptural knowledge of 'the great:'—

'I wish you could see a picture Sir Joshua has just finished of the Prophet Samuel, on his being called. "The gaze of young astonishment" was never so beautifully expressed. Sir Joshua tells me that he is exceedingly mortified when he shows this picture to some of the great—they ask him who Samuel was? I told him he must get somebody to make an Oratorio of Samuel, and then it would not be vulgar to confess they knew something of him. He said he was glad to find that I was intimately acquainted with that devoted prophet.'

The friendship which subsisted between Garrick and Miss More, as it was of the strongest and most affectionate description, was decidedly beneficial to the young author in forming her taste; and may we add, by opening her eyes to the folly and frivolity of the happiness, arising from those pursuits, from which all that great actor's celebrity and eminence arose. Garrick himself, in spite of his profession, as he was one of the most gifted, so he was one of the most amiable men of his time. Johnson's memorable reproof to him, when, in the full tide and triumph of his intoxicating popularity, he had taken the philosopher over his house and grounds, and shown him his statues, and pictures, and costly furniture—'Ah! David, David, what will all these avail thee on a death bed?'—would seem to have made an impression on him, which resulted, if not in conviction, at least in decided seriousness of mind. He was deeply sensible of the evils inseparable from a theatrical life; and no man ever attained such an unapproachable eminence in his profession without being contaminated, for an instant, with its follies or its crimes. The feelings which such a woman as Hannah More ever entertained for his memory are a proof of this; and the following decisive testimony to his character and private life will measure, in a religious mind, with the sorrow it cannot but feel for the perversion of such splendid talents. It is, we believe, more than could be said of any other actor that ever flourished:—

'I can never cease to remember, with affection and gratitude, so warm, steady, and disinterested a friend; and I can most truly bear this testimony to his memory, that I never witnessed, in any family, more decorum, propriety, and regularity than in his: where I never saw a card, or even met (except in one instance) a person of his own profession at his table; of which Mrs. Garrick, by her elegance of taste, her correctness of manners, and very original turn of humor, was the brightest ornament. All his pursuits and tastes were so decidedly intellectual, that it made the society, and the conversation which was always to be found in his circle, interesting and delightful.'

The grief and sorrow felt by his friends at his death was sincere and universal; and the following extract from a letter to Miss H. More from Mrs. Montagu, beautifully completes a picture, which it rejoices us to admire:—

'There never was a time in which dear Mrs. Garrick's kind attention would not have made its impression; but at this time it touches my heart in a degree not possible to be expressed. My bodily illness has been slight; but for her loss, my loss, yours, the world's, my mind has been sick indeed. Talents like Mr. Garrick's must ever excite the admiration of mankind; but possessed of so many virtues, adorned by so many graces, they are so endeared to one's affections, so ingrafted in one's esteem, that the loss can never be repaired, never be forgotten. Some consolation, however, arises from those excellencies which render our loss irreparable. His untainted morals in a situation exposed to temptation—his perfect rectitude of conduct through the whole course of his life—his amiable and kind domestic behavior—his generosity and fidelity to his relations—and his charity to the poor and distressed, will ever be remembered by the age in

which he lived, and recorded to ages to come. For some days after the sad event, I contemplated only the great parts of his character, and my sorrow was deep; but I hoped time would, in some degree, familiarize my mind with it; but, alas! so many little graces, so many pleasing qualities of it every moment present themselves to my recollection, that the grief is still new.'

We have dwelt thus on Garrick's character, and Miss More's intimacy with him, because that intimacy had a most essential influence upon her future life; and, as her biographer justly says, his death may be considered an era in her life. It separated that influence which bound her to the fascinating frivolities of a city life; and it left her strong original propensities to their natural course. It broke the spell which bound her to the world; and retreating more and more within herself, she began from that hour to apply her great powers to their proper use:—

'She was not a person, however,' says Mr. Roberts, 'to be actuated by sudden and overpowering impulses, or to be hurried into any adoption, especially one which implied a change of principle and habit, without much consideration both of the end and the means. From the death of Garrick to her retreat to Cowslip Green, an interval of about five years, she gradually proceeded in redeeming her time, and detaching herself from engagements, which, however agreeable to her taste and talents, kept her from answering the higher vocation which summoned her to the service of the soul, and labors of love.'

After the death of Garrick, Miss More was forced, by the importunity of friends, to bring out a tragedy, called 'The Fatal Falsehood,' the greater part of which had been written under the inspection of her deceased friend. It met with considerable success, though the author, probably even then agitated with conscientious scruples, was, as her sister writes, 'mighty indifferent about the matter.' For several years she continued to visit and spend several months with Mrs. Garrick, who had retired almost completely from the world; and each time she became more and more weaned from the follies of society. She began to perceive that powers like hers were given for higher purposes than visiting, and evening parties; and by assiduous reading of the best authors, she stored her mind with that religious knowledge afterward so conspicuous in her works. Before, then, we leave this glittering period of her life for the more useful and permanent labors by which she soon after distinguished herself, we will cull for our readers some most interesting extracts from her correspondence relative to the individuals eminent in literary history, among whom she mingled.

Among these Dr. Johnson, of course, stands pre-eminent. Boswell has already recorded several notices of her society; and it was thought that nothing respecting this great man had escaped the diligence of his biographers. It was esteemed a miracle of industry when Croker added two thousand five hundred notes to his late edition of Boswell. But these relics of a cotemporary and intimate of Johnson have unlocked the treasures of another age; and, like a legacy from the past, disclose to us new facts and opinions, fresh, original, and unrifled. Here, for instance, is a fine illustration of Johnson's fine and correct, as well as his sturdy and somewhat unceremonious sense of morality:—

'*London*, 1780.

'I spent a very comfortable day yesterday with Miss Reynolds; only Dr. Johnson, and Mrs. Williams, and myself. He is in but poor health, but his mind has lost nothing of its vigor. He never opens his mouth but one learns something; one is sure either of hearing a new idea, or an old one expressed in an original manner. We did not part till eleven. He scolded me heartily, as usual, when I differed from him in opinion; and, as usual, laughed when I flattered him. I was very bold in combating some of his darling prejudices: nay, I ventured to defend one or two of the Puritans, whom I forced him to allow to be good men and good writers. He said, he was not angry with me at all for liking Baxter—he liked him himself. "But, then," said he, "Baxter was bred up in the establishment, and would have died in it if he could have got the living of Kidderminster. He was a very good man." Here he was wrong; for Baxter was offered a bishopric after the restoration.

I never saw Johnson really angry with me but once; and his displeasure did him so much honor that I loved him the better for it. I alluded rather flippantly, I fear, to some witty passage in "Tom Jones." He replied, "I am shocked to hear you quote from so vicious a book. I am sorry to hear you have read it; a confession which no modest lady should ever make. I scarcely know a more corrupt work." I thanked him for his correction; assured him I thought full as ill of it now as he did, and had only read it at an age when I was more subject to be caught by the wit than able to discern the mischief. Of Joseph Andrews I declared my decided abhorrence. He went so far as to refuse to Fielding the great talents which are ascribed to him, and broke out into a noble panegyric on his competitor Richardson; who, he said, was as superior to him in talents as in virtue, and whom he pronounced to be the greatest genius that had shed its lustre on this path of literature.'

It would require, in our day, a social independence, even more privileged than Johnson's, to reprove so pointedly, in a young lady of Hannah More's literary eminence, the confession of having read the fashionable immorality of a popular novel; yet every clergyman could tell how much it would be needed.

Here is another characteristic anecdote, which is not the less amusing that it has appeared before:—

'*London*, 1781.

'Mrs. B. having repeatedly desired Johnson to look over her new play of the "Siege of Sinope" before it was acted, he always found means to evade it; at last she pressed him so closely that he actually refused to do it, and told her that she herself, by carefully looking it over, would be able to see if there was any thing amiss as well as he could. "But, sir," said she, "I have no time. I have already so many irons in the fire." "Why, then, madam," said he, (quite out of patience,) "the best thing I can advise you to do is to put your tragedy along with your irons!"

We add a note by the biographer to this passage, exemplifying a highly honorable trait in Hannah More's character. It is said of Ro-

bert Hall, who possessed satirical powers of remarkable strength, that he formed a similar resolution, and as rigidly preserved it.

'In the course of the theatrical management of her friend David Garrick, he had irritated the feelings of the authoress here alluded to, by the rejection of her tragedy. The lady indulged her spleen in a novel, the express purpose of which was to ridicule and vilify the character of the manager. Miss H. More was prevailed upon to write a criticism on the work for the Gentleman's Magazine, which she performed with much spirit and effect; but finding, as she declared, so much pleasure in the free indulgence of sarcastic humor, she resolved never again to trust herself with the use of such a weapon, and to this resolution she strictly adhered through the remainder of her life.'

This portion of our subject is very tempting; but our space warns us not to enlarge. We shall, therefore, merely insert another anecdote or two, and refer our readers to the volumes for richer and more interesting—more varied, and more entertaining details—than could be met with, we are persuaded, in any other volume of our modern literature. The following extract, in these times of temperance reform, must have a forcible effect. When so great a mind as Dr. Johnson's could find no security against intemperance, but in total abstinence, who will presume to gainsay its necessity?

'*London*, 1782.

'I dined very pleasantly one day last week at the Bishop of Chester's. Johnson was there, and the bishop was very desirous to draw him out, as he wished to show him off to some of the company who had never seen him. He begged me to sit next him at dinner, and to devote myself to making him talk. To this end, I consented to talk more than became me, and our stratagem succeeded. You would have enjoyed seeing him take me by the hand in the middle of dinner, and repeat, with no small enthusiasm, many passages from the "Fair Penitent," &c. I urged him to take a *little* wine. He replied, "I can't drink a *little*, child, therefore I never touch it. Abstinence is as easy to me as *temperance* would be difficult.'

While on the subject of Dr. Johnson, we may refer the reader for some curious and interesting particulars respecting his last moments to p. 214, vol. i. A modern reviewer* has affected to doubt the authenticity of these facts, and sneers at the possibility of the author of the 'Prayers and Meditations' requiring, in his last moments, the aid of the atonement. But, while there is no reason to doubt the veracity of the document, those who have perused his works, or traced his life in Boswell's eulogistic narrative, will be able to estimate the extent of Johnson's experimental religion; and could even the cynical reviewer have been admitted to one of the 'great sage's' midnight orgies, at the 'Turk's Head,' he might be forced to admit, that even he, in spite of all the ostentatious morality of his writings, would be found in his dying moments very far from being independent of the atoning merits of his Savior.

The other anecdote, of which we spoke, we must make room for.

* London Quarterly Review, No. civ, p. 431.

Lord Monboddo's bursting into tears is no more than any heart of sensibility would accord to the exalted heroism it describes; and Hannah More pronounced no more than its just eulogium, when she said, '*It was above poetry.*'

'*Hampton*, 1782.

'The other morning the captain of one of Commodore Johnson's Dutch prizes breakfasted at Sir Charles Middleton's, and related the following little anecdote:—One day he went out of his own ship to dine on board another; while he was there a storm arose, which in a short time made an entire wreck of his own ship, to which it was impossible for him to return. He had left on board two little boys, one four, the other five years old, under the care of a poor black servant. The people struggled to get out of the sinking ship into a large boat; and the poor black took his two little children, tied them into a bag, and put in a little pot of sweetmeats for them, slung them across his shoulder, and put them into the boat. The boat by this time was quite full. The black was stepping into it himself; but was told by the master there was no room for him, that either he or the children must perish; for the weight of both would sink the boat. The exalted heroic negro did not hesitate a moment. "Very well," said he, "give my duty to my master; and tell him I beg pardon for all my faults." And then—guess the rest—plunged to the bottom never to rise again till the sea shall give up her dead. I told it the other day to Lord Monboddo, who fairly burst into tears. The greatest lady in this land wants me to make an elegy of it; but it is above poetry.'

We must now proceed to notice Hannah More's literary labors, not indeed so fully as we could wish, but so as to convey an idea of their magnitude and importance. After the successful representation of her Percy and Fatal Falsehood, her awakened mind became deeply convinced of the pernicious tendency of all stage exhibitions; and this, once impressed upon her understanding, in spite alike of certainty of success and of strong predilection, she had strength of purpose to renounce for ever the tempting path of theatrical fame; and lest her own example might prove an obstacle to her future usefulness, she published both her tragedies, with an admirably-written preface, in which she unanswerably denounced stage exhibitions and dramatic compositions as '*the most profligate in the literature of the world.*' But, aware of her incompetency to stem the torrent of the age, she attempted, with the younger portion of society, to divert it into another and less hurtful channel. With this view she published, in 1782, her Sacred Dramas. This work had for its subjects, The finding of Moses, David and Goliah, Belshazzar, and Daniel, and immediately attained a very great popularity. Though we cannot approve of the holy records of inspiration as subjects for the drama;—and if dramatic literature in its ordinary forms is pernicious, it becomes a perversion little less than impious to apply to it the awful name of sacred;—still, the subject, guided by the pure and thoughtful genius of Hannah More, was sure not to be treated improperly; and on the state of society on which these Scripture dramas told they had a better effect than the vile trash of imagined nonsense, which constituted, in a great measure, the current literature of the day.

Bas Bleu was one of Hannah More's most popular early productions. It is a eulogistic and satirical Hudibrastic poem in defence of a literary society, which, with herself, numbered all the leading characters of the day among its members; and from which originated the celebrated term 'blue stocking,' from Mr. Stillingfleet, the learned, scientific naturalist, who used to attend Mrs. Vesey's, where its meetings were held, in hose of that remarkable color. As the subject and the author were at that time highly fashionable, this poem obtained general and warm praise. Johnson, in particular, from it gave her the name of the 'best versificatrix in the English language;' at all events its early celebrity has transferred its name, par excellence, to all literary ladies ever since.

We cannot pass over, at this period of Hannah More's history, a circumstance, which may be called a species of literary *ana;* and is one of the most remarkable instances of ingratitude we can recollect. This is the story of Anne Yearsley, the celebrated poetical Milkwoman, or Lactilla, as she was called, in the poetical parlance of the day. Mr. Roberts thus describes the manner in which Miss More's acquaintance with her commenced:—

'During Hannah More's residence with her sisters at Bristol, in the summer of this year, 1784, an extraordinary object was presented to the benevolence of the family. Their cook informed them, that the person who called daily for the kitchen stuff, for the maintenance of her pig, was, with her husband and several children, absolutely perishing with hunger; and drew such a picture of their distress as excited their liveliest compassion. They lost no time in endeavouring to rescue this wretched family, and soon discovered that the woman was possessed of extraordinary talents, which not even the last stage of famine and misery could repress. She produced several scraps of her poetry, in which were striking indications of genius. It immediately occurred to Miss H. More that this talent might be made the means of exciting a general interest in her behalf, and raising a fund to set her up in some creditable way of earning her subsistence. She accordingly took a great deal of pains in furnishing her with some of the common rules of writing, spelling, and composition; and while the object of her charity was preparing, under her inspection, a small collection of poems, she was employing herself in writing statements of the case to all her friends of rank and fortune to bespeak subscriptions to this work, setting forth the probability of being enabled, after allowing the woman a certain portion of the sum raised, to apprentice out the children with the remainder. The generous zeal with which Miss H. More's friends seconded her wishes, soon produced a sum exceeding 600*l.*, which was placed in the funds under the trusteeship of Mrs. Montagu and herself. During thirteen months her time was chiefly engrossed by her exertions in this woman's cause, in whose service, she has been heard to say, she calculated, that, in transcribing and correcting her poems, and in letters of application, she had written more than a thousand pages.'

Notwithstanding all this, the abandoned woman abused her benefactress in the most indefatigable and shameless manner, because she would not place the large sum which she had collected for her chil-

dren's benefit at her disposal. Let Miss More's words, in a letter to Mr. Pepys, terminate the history,—

'I am come to the postscript, without having found courage to tell you what I am sure you will hear with pain, at least it gives *me* infinite pain to write it—I mean the most open and notorious ingratitude of our milk woman. There is hardly a species of slander the poor unhappy creature does not propagate against me, in the most public manner, because I have called her a *milk woman*, and because I have placed the money in the funds, instead of letting her spend it. I confess my weakness—it goes to my heart, not for my own sake, but for the sake of our common nature; so much for my *inward* feelings: as to my *active* resentment, I am trying to get a place for her husband, and am endeavouring to make up the sum I have raised for her to five hundred pounds. Do not let this harden *your* heart or mine against any future object. *Fate bene per voi*, is a beautiful maxim.

One of her charges is, that I design to defraud her children of the money after her death; and this to my face, the second time she saw me after I came hither. Poor human nature! I could weep over thee!'

She finally got the money into her hands, as she desired; and some years after, this vile woman attempted, in a new edition of her poems, to keep alive her slanders; but the only notice this noble Christian lady took of it, will be found in the following extract from a letter to Horace Walpole:—

'My old friend the milk woman has just brought out another new book, which you may possess for five shillings, and which she has advertised to be quite free from *my* corruptions. She has prefixed to it twenty pages of scurrility.

Do, dear sir, join me in sincere compassion, without one atom of resentment, (for that I solemnly protest is the state of my mind toward her,) for a human heart of such unaccountable depravity as to harbor such deep malice for two years, though she has gained her point, and the money is settled to her wish. If I wanted to punish an enemy, it should be by fastening on him the trouble of constantly hating somebody.'

Many years after, on learning that the poor creature was violently sick, we thus find the noble benefactress still, though covertly, wishing to do her good:—

'I think very often with concern of poor Yearsley's situation. I could get a famous medicine which has done wonders, if you can contrive to find out if she would take it; but I suppose the poor creature would be afraid to take any thing of my recommending. Perhaps Mr. B—— could contrive to inquire without naming me. I should be happy to relieve her, and no time should be lost.'

We must now pass over pages by the score of the most interesting and delightful correspondence to bring, within this limited article, some notice of the events, literary and personal, in Miss More's subsequent life. The solid virtue of her character had triumphed at last over the tempting frivolities of fashionable life, and the dangerous incense of

flattering admirers; and except an annual visit to her old and attached friend, Mrs. Garrick, she constantly resided in the country, ardently devoted to its simple pleasures, and engaged in the composition of those great works, upon which rest her usefulness and her fame.

About the year 1785 she published a small poem on slavery, which we notice now as chiefly remarkable for the following prophetic lines, which she happily lived to see realized half a century nearly after they were written:—

> 'And now her high commission from above,
> Stamp'd with the holy characters of love,
> The meek-eyed spirit waving in her hand,
> Breathes manumission o'er the rescued land.
>
> She tears the banner, stain'd with blood and tears,
> And, LIBERTY! thy shining standard rears;
> As the bright ensign's glory she displays,
> See pale OPPRESSION faints beneath the blaze.
>
> The giant dies! no more his frown appals,
> The chain, untouch'd, drops off; the fetter falls:
> Astonish'd Echo tells the vocal shore—
> Oppression's fallen, and slavery is no more!
>
> The dusky myriads crowd the sultry plain,
> And hail that MERCY long invoked in vain.
> Victorious power! she bursts their two-fold bands,
> And FAITH and FREEDOM spring from Britain's hands!'

The first of that great series of ethical works with which Hannah More's name is so gloriously identified, and which cannot be denied the praise of having contributed to the moral reformation of the age, was an anonymous pamphlet, called 'Thoughts on the Manners of the Great.' Here, at least, she showed, that if she had mingled in the follies of fashionable life, she had, like the bees of Hymettus, extracted honey from what would have poisoned others. The work is written with a spirit of fearless and searching truth, not only displaying an intimate knowledge of the society she describes, but a chastened yet fervent zeal for the blessings of a neglected religion, which, couched in her own admirable style, had great power and effect. The work was most extensively read, and obtained for its author, who was soon discovered, the reputation of being one of the first moralists of the age.

During the year 1789, Miss More was herself enabled to withdraw, in a great measure, from the society which she had reproved so ably. Her sisters having acquired sufficient affluence to enable them to retire altogether into private life, they had built themselves a house in Bath, between which and Hannah's cottage of Cowslip Green they spent the greatest portion of their time. The awful moral destitution of the neighboring peasantry, and more particularly their children, made a powerful impression on her mind; and, with characteristic energy, Miss More immediately set about improving it as far as lay in her power. Here originated that well-known school system, which afterward, in spite of every opposition, was attended with such signal success and lasting benefit to the poor. Mr. Roberts gives the following account of their first operations, which, at that time, may fairly be called, if we except those under the direction of Wesley, without parallel in the British empire:—

'During the summer of the year 1791, the sisters resided altogether at Cowslip Green; and recognizing the hand of the Almighty in the success of their undertaking at Cheddar, they resolved upon attempting an extension of their benevolent efforts by setting forward other schools in the neighborhood. The difficulties they had to surmount appear in a regular and simple journal kept at the time. Some of the opulent farmers, to whom they applied in making their extensive rounds, received them with civility; but, upon opening their business, assured them that the novelties they were introducing would be the ruin of agriculture. Others, more favorably disposed, told them that they had read something about Sunday schools in the Bristol papers, and believed they might be very good things for keeping children from robbing their orchards. And, upon the whole, as it was distinctly announced that no subscriptions would be called for, they were met by the farmers with less hostility than they had expected. Two mining villages, at the top of Mendip, particularly attracted their attention. These were ignorant and depraved even beyond those of Cheddar,—so ignorant as to apprehend a design to make money by carrying off their children for slaves. The place was considered as so ferocious, that no constable would venture there to execute his office; and these bold instructresses were warned by their friends that they were bringing their own lives into danger. They were not, however, to be deterred by any consideration of personal danger; and beginning to perceive who was helping them, by the solid improvement which was spreading around them, and particularly by an increasing attendance at Church, they did not rest till they had procured the same benefits for no less than ten parishes in the neighborhood where there were no resident clergymen. Their first step upon entering each parish was to obtain from the incumbent of the living his acquiescence in their interference, which was generally granted with alacrity; and in a short time the number of children under their instruction rather exceeded twelve hundred.'

We must add to this an extract from one of her own delightful letters, describing an annual dinner, which her generous bounty had provided for her children:—

'I have kept this scrawl some days for want of time to finish it—so busy have we been in preparing for a grand celebrity, distinguished by the pompous name of *Mendip Feast;* the range of hills you remember in this country; on the top of which we yesterday gave a dinner of beef, and plum pudding, and cider, to our schools. There were not six hundred children; for I would not admit the *new* schools, telling them they must be good for a year or two to be entitled to so great a thing as a dinner. We had two tents pitched on the hill, our cloth was spread around, and we were enclosed in a fence, within which, in a circle, the children sat. We all went in waggons; and carried a large company of our own to carve for the children, who sung psalms very prettily in the intervals. Curiosity had drawn a great multitude for a country so thinly peopled: one wondered whence five thousand people, for that was the calculation, could come. I was very uneasy at seeing this, lest it should disturb the decorum of the festivity. Almost all the clergy of the neighborhood came; and I

desired a separate minister to say grace to each parish. At the conclusion, I permitted a general chorus of "God save the king," telling them I expected that loyalty should make a part of their religion. We all parted with the most perfect peace, having fed about nine hundred people for less than a *fine* dinner for twenty costs. The day was the finest imaginable; and we got home safe, and I hope thankful, about eight miles in our waggons.'

Hannah More, about this time, followed up her popular work on the Manners of the Great, by '*An Estimate of the Religion of the Fashionable World*,' in which the increasing solemnity of her religious views is rendered apparent; and she drew still more strongly the broad line of demarkation between her former gay friends and the truly humble and devout Christian. In fact, this work could never have been written but by one who had drank at the wells of salvation, and deeply experienced the saving power of grace. No one can read her letters, and particularly an interesting fragment of her journal, at this time, without being convinced that her soul was in intimate communion with her Maker, and enjoying the blessed fruits of a close acquaintance with her Savior. We regret that the history of her conversion is lost to the religious world, and that her biographer has neglected to give us explicit information on this all-important topic. To have been able to trace the incipient operations of grace upon a mind so 'marked by Heaven'—so richly endowed with the most splendid qualifications—so much exposed, by strength of genius, by brilliancy of imagination, by the applause of admiring friends, and the fervency and vigor of her own social feelings, to be led astray from that narrow path, which leads alone to heaven—would have been a lesson of instruction and importance to every inquiring Christian. A path, not generally the choice of proud but erring genius, where all the fascinating gifts that wean the heart from God must be crucified to the world, and sanctified by Divine grace, ere they can become rightly employed, or afford the heart those high and holy enjoyments which the world 'wots not of,' and which atone so purely and so effectually for the vain and unsubstantial pleasures of gayety and sin. With Hannah More every step of the road to heaven must have been attended with crosses severer, and more hard to bear, than those of ordinary endowments, and, in ordinary society, can have any knowledge of. We have seen her, in the spring-time of life, when a warm and untutored heart like hers would be most open to receive impressions, and liable to retain them, a loved and admired inmate in the splendid residence of Garrick—that all but worshipped idol of theatrical applause; the crowned head of dramatic representatives; and himself the god, and his house the temple of fashion's giddy idolatry. We have seen her mingle with the great, the learned, the gay, the thoughtless, caressed in every circle, and viewing the world and its enjoyments, when all was glowing with the rainbow tints of the 'purple light of youth;' and yet, throughout the whole, we have seen her wean her heart gradually from all—dropping, one by one, her unprofitable acquaintance—resigning the tempting applause of critics, and the admiration of friends, to cleave to the ways of righteousness—to dedicate herself and her powers to her Maker's cause. That we have not the records of the gradual change by which a gracious Heaven reclaimed its own, will ever be a serious loss to those who love to trace

the dealings of God with his children, the following extracts from her private journal sufficiently attest:—

'*Sunday, Jan.* 19, 1794.—Heard of the death of Mr. Gibbon the historian, the calumniator of the despised Nazarene, the derider of Christianity. Awful dispensation! He too was my acquaintance. Lord, I bless thee, considering how much infidel acquaintance I have had, that my soul never came into their secret! How many souls have his writings polluted! Lord, preserve others from their contagion!

Sunday, Feb. 9.—This has been a hurrying week to me, in trying to raise money for the militia shoes; so much writing and talking, that there has been little leisure for reading—little disposition for communion with God. When shall I gain more self possession? When shall I be able to do business with the world, without catching the spirit of the world? Another friend dead, Richard Burke! witty, eloquent. How vain those talents without the one thing needful! I thank God that He hath shown me the vanity of genius, and given me a comparative deadness to reputation. Lord! do thou increase it, till I become quite mortified to the world. A fresh subject for praise this night—my dear friend Wilberforce carried one clause of the slave bill. Lord! hasten the time when true liberty, light, and knowledge shall be diffused over the whole earth!'

* * * * * * * * *

'*July* 13.—Prayed with some comfort; but my mind was too much in other concerns. Have much business on my hands at this time; and though it is all of a charitable and religious nature, (for I humbly design never to have any other,) yet still the detail of it draws away my soul and thoughts from God. When shall I be purified?'

* * * * * * * * *

'*September.*—Confined this week with four days' headache; an unprofitable time—thoughts wandering—little communion with God. I see by every fresh trial that the time of sickness is seldom the season for religious improvement. This great work should be done in health, or it will seldom be well done. O for better preparation for sickness and death!

Sunday, September 14.—Cheddar—a very blessed day, between three and four hundred young and old; many seriously impressed. This has revived my hopes that God will enable us to carry on this very extensive work, in spite of the heavy loss of our dear school mistress. May we be deeply humbled under a sense of our own unworthiness for this work! May thy glory, and the good of souls, be our only end! *We are* nothing—*have* nothing—and of ourselves can *do* nothing.

Sunday, September 21.—Stayed at home on account of the weather. Read and prayed with some degree of comfort, which was invaded by the reflection that we might have been doing good at the schools. For some days have found more comfort in prayer, more warmth and spirit; but still lamentably defective—above all in *family prayer.* What is read by others makes little impression on me—not so in extemporary prayer. Yet I have a fear that it is novelty, or curiosity, that catches me. Lord, let my heart, and not my ear, be seized upon!'

* * * * * * * * *

'*Sunday, September* 28.—When will my heart be a fit tabernacle for the Spirit of purity? Have lately had much communion with God in the night. I grow, I hope, more disposed to convert silence and solitude into seasons of prayer. I think, also, I fear death less. I am much tried by the temper of others. Lord, subdue my *own* evil tempers! Let me constantly think of Him "who endured such contradiction of sinners against himself."

I endeavor to convert my retirements to holy purposes at this time. I find much pleasure and profit in a course of Henry's exposition of St. Luke. It is now, I think, five years since I have been enabled, by the grace of God, in a good degree, to give up all human studies. I have not allowed myself to read any classic or pagan author for many years—I mean by myself. These are but small sacrifices that I am called to make. Give me grace, O God, for greater, if thou callest me to them! I desire to ascribe it to thy grace that I have long since had much pleasure in serious books. I now willingly read little of which religion is not the subject. I do not glory in this, but am humbled by reflecting that constant use of the means has not made me more devout, and that my thoughts at other times are not more holy.'

Any person reading these simple and solitary confessions of the heart must feel assured of the writer's devotion to one purpose, and be convinced that Hannah More's soul was the subject of deep and gracious visitations of the Holy Spirit. She is said to have objected to Methodism; but Wesley, or Nelson, or Walsh, or Fletcher, could not have written more pure unsophisticated Methodism than this.

But a time was coming when England and mankind, in common cause, had need of all the minds of religious purity and unshaken firmness that could be found, to meet a storm, the like of which has never burst upon the world. The French revolution swept, like a tornado, over the stricken earth. There was a breaking up of old institutions, and a fearful rending of settled opinions, when that beautiful light of liberty, which at first dazzled all minds with its captivating brightness, fed by unholy passions and infamous desires, was turned into the maddening and consuming blaze of the fearful torch, with which revolution illumed the path of her frantic followers. Every mind, impressed with the importance of religious principles and of social order, rallied round the menaced altar, and the tottering throne. Then, in tones and in writings of unrivalled eloquence, the greatest political philosopher the world has ever known stood forth in defence of the holy institutions threatened with destruction. Then Robert Hall too, himself an ardent liberal, raised his energetic voice in solemn warning against the advancing torrent of infidelity. But Burke, and similar great men, could affect only the higher and middling classes of society. The deadly poison, with contagious strength and unseen power, was working upon the minds of the great mass of the community, beyond the reach of ordinary exertions, and unaffected by the masterly arguments which swayed the reason of superior intelligences. In a female of delicate health, but of mind endowed for the occasion, was found the benefactor of mankind who supplied the antidote. Hannah More at once became the defender of her revered religion, at once the undaunted opponent of that turbulent and destructive anarchy, which was fast spreading

through the land, and sapping, in its progress, all that was sound in morality or sacred in religion. The very success of her exertions to teach the poor to read, seemed to impose upon her the necessity of furnishing them useful matter to peruse to prevent their newly-acquired education being perverted to the most insidious and effectual means of their moral destruction. 'The friends of insurrection, infidelity, and vice,' we are told, 'carried their exertions so far as to load asses with their pernicious pamphlets, and to get them dropped, not only in cottages and in highways, but into mines and coal pits.' Miss More's plan was to defeat the enemy with his own tools; and by supplying the lower orders with similar pamphlets of a sound moral and religious tendency, and of a more attractive style, to pre-occupy the ground, and nip the evil in its bud. Mr. Roberts gives the following account of her design and its success:—

'The success of "Village Politics" encouraged her to venture on a more extensive undertaking. This was to produce regularly every month three tracts, consisting of stories, ballads, and Sunday readings, written in a lively and popular manner; by these means she hoped to circulate religious knowledge as well as innocent entertainment, by way of counteraction to the poison which was continually flowing through the channel of vulgar, licentious, and seditious publications.

When she considered the multitudes whose sole reading was limited to those vicious performances, and that the temptation was obtruded upon them in the streets, or invitingly hung out upon the wall, or from the window, she thought the evil she wished to oppose was so exceedingly diffused, as to justify her employing such remedial means as were likely to become effectual, both by their simplicity and brevity. Being aware that sermons, catechisms, and other articles of preceptive piety were abundantly furnished by the excellent institutions already formed, she preferred what was novel and striking to what was merely didactic. As the school of Paine had been laboring to undermine, not only religious establishments, but good government, by the alluring vehicles of novels, stories, and songs, she thought it right to fight them with their own weapons. As she had observed that, to bring dignities into contempt, and to render the clerical character odious, was a favorite object with the enemy, her constant aim was to oppose it in the way she thought most likely to produce effect. The Jacobinical writers had indeed used various arts to alienate the people from the Church by undermining their respect for its ministers. She therefore scarcely ever produced a tract, in which it was not a part of her plan to introduce an exemplary parish priest.

As she proposed to undersell the trash she meant to oppose, she found that the expense would prevent the possibility of her carrying on the scheme without a subscription; and she no sooner published proposals of her plan than it was warmly taken up by the wisest and best characters in the country.

The success surpassed her most sanguine expectations. Two millions of the publications were sold in the first year; a circumstance, perhaps, new in the annals of printing. The exertion it required to produce, or to procure from others (for two or three friends and one of her sisters occasionally assisted her) three tracts every month, for three years, to organize the plan, and to keep up a correspondence

with the various committees formed in almost every part of the kingdom, materially undermined her health; and this was not the only sacrifice she made to her country and to humanity. She devoted to these labors that time which she might have employed in writings that would have greatly increased her yearly income; an increase which her large disbursements for her schools must have rendered expedient. Perceiving that they had not only made their way into kitchens and nurseries, but even into drawing rooms, she at length judged it expedient to have them handsomely printed in three volumes.'

Miss More was soon called to know the efficacy of religion in supporting her under one of the most extraordinary and malevolent persecutions with which the fame of any eminent individual was ever sought to be darkened. This was occasioned by her disinterested exertions, at a sacrifice both of money and of time, which few of her means and her talents would have afforded—to give education to the poor of an extensive and neglected district. It originated with the Rev. Mr. Bere, the curate of Blagdon, a man who had once given his full consent and cordial assent to her measures, and even requested her to form a school in his parish; and who seems to have had no other *earthly* motive for his subsequent conduct than envy at the wonderful success which Miss More's institutions, and the exertions of her pious teacher, had in reforming the morals of a place once notoriously wicked. This miserable instrument in the hands of the wicked one once wrote to Miss More, thanking her for the good she had done in his parish, and informing her 'that two sessions and two assizes are past, and a third of each nearly approaching, and neither a prosecutor nor prisoner, plaintiff or defendant, has this parish, once so notorious for crimes and litigation, supplied.' Yet while he bore this high and true testimony to the merits of her school, he was secretly endeavoring by every means in his power to suppress it; and failing in his object covertly, he at length broke out into open enmity against the revered and virtuous lady, whose superior sanctity so annoyed him, assailing her with the most unheard-of calumnies, and stirring up against her every imaginable species of annoyance and persecution. Much of this necessarily defeated itself. She was accused of disaffection to the Church and king; of being a Jacobin; and many other things equally ridiculous and unwarrantable. For three years the wretched curate continued his persecution, until at length he attained his object. The school was discontinued; and the reverend conqueror attained as his just reward the disgraceful notoriety of success. Her biographer tells us,—'Through all these attacks she preserved the dignity of silence; and when advised by Lord-chancellor Loughborough to prosecute the author of a scandalous pamphlet against her, she declared her resolution never, upon any provocation, to embark either in controversy or litigation—a passive pertinacity which tended notoriously to increase the effrontery of her assailants.'

To a young clergyman in the neighborhood, who took an interest in her schools, she thus writes about this time,—

'I think your definition of faith not an inaccurate one. Your track seems to be right; you have only to pursue it,—to press on, not to count yourself to have attained; to trust in Christ and to preach him, not as our *redemption* only, for that would be a cheap way of being

religious, but as our *sanctification* also. Frequent and fervent prayer for a greater conformity to the will of God and a nearer likeness to Christ; a self-denying and a self-renouncing spirit; as much zeal in holiness and good works as if we had no Savior to trust to, with as absolute a trust in His merits and sacrifice as if we did nothing ourselves; earnest supplications for His grace and for the illumination of His spirit—these seem to me to be a sort of general outline, in all which, however short we may come, yet by having it in our eye as the great object of pursuit, the thoughts and desires of the heart being bent on the attainment, in spite of all our frequent failings and great deficiencies, we shall, I doubt not, find that the light within us will grow brighter and brighter unto the perfect day. Some spiritual difficulties and partial blindnesses obstruct, I doubt not, every true believer, on his being first awakened, and greatly retard his progress. All this is necessary to keep us humble and lowly, that temper of mind which alone can enable us to resemble our gracious Redeemer. An humble, doubting soul, which casts all its care upon Him, is, I venture to think, far more acceptable to God than many who appear, to human eyes, to be more strong in faith and more confident in security.'

Among the other opprobrious crimes laid to her charge at this stormy time, we need hardly wonder that the climax was added in calling her 'a Methodist'—one who would read the extract above quoted would think with some justice, however little she might know it. Yet in an elaborate vindication of her character, addressed to the bishop of Bath and Wells, this excellent Christian thought proper to vindicate herself from the aspersion in the following words:—

'As to connection with conventicles of any kind, I never had any. Had I been irregular, should I not have gone sometimes during my winter residence at Bath to Lady Huntingdon's chapel, a place of great occasional resort? Should I never have gone to some of Whitfield's or Wesley's tabernacles in London, where I have spent a long spring for near thirty years? Should I not have strayed now and then into some Methodist meeting in the country? Yet not one of these things have I ever done.'

It is not our wish to comment on the 'infirmities of the saints:' nor will we offer a remark on the peculiar 'righteousness' of Miss More's religious views, which for thirty years could keep her from 'straying' to hear the Gospel preached by two eminent servants of God, because they were 'irregular.' She appears to have been an eminently pious female, whose labors were abundantly owned of God in her day and generation. But we may well remark on the exalted testimony which the application of this term of reproach bears to the character of the early Methodists, when only those individuals who were signalized above their cotemporaries for unusual holiness of life, or zeal for religion, were honored with the high distinction of being *stigmatized* as 'a Methodist.' Happily religion is no longer such a rarity as to be marked by any distinctive epithet; but we cannot the less help thinking that it would have been more for Hannah More's credit, had she exclaimed, like the sainted Fletcher, on hearing that the Methodists were a people who prayed all day and night, 'Then, by the blessing of

God, I will find them out;' instead of taking merit to her diocesan for having carefully shunned them during thirty years.

In the year 1799 she published her third ethical work, 'Strictures on Female Education,' one of the most able she has given to the world, in which she attacked the insidious evils of fashionable life in their strongest hold, and put a climax to her former works on the same subject. This production met throughout the nation generally with high and merited encouragement. But in spite of its unquestioned excellence as a guide to a rational instruction, its solemn and decided religious tone, and the fervency with which the importance of the topic was urged, it turned against her many of those high Church dignitaries, her former friends, whose drowsy piety was alarmed at the prospect of any other road to heaven than the formal routine of the prayer book. Archdeacon Daubeny denounced it with great bitterness on this account, but Mrs. More never answered his strictures, and the criticism expired with the critic. In 1805 she published her celebrated work, 'Hints toward forming the Character of a young Princess,' which, with a peculiar reference to the Princess Charlotte, may be found of eminent advantage to every grade of life. The religion of this work also made it an object of attack with the skeptical and the lukewarm. The Edinburgh Review attacked Hannah More with extreme severity on its account. She treated the diatribe with her usual silence, and it is forgotten. In 1809 was published her celebrated 'Cœlebs in search of a Wife,' one of the few works of fiction which we may feel safe in entirely commending. She made it for the same reason which composed the Sacred Dramas—the reading public was deluged with innumerable novels, the greater part of which, formed of vicious sentiment and exaggerated passion, acted like a moral poison on the imaginations of the young. To counteract this as far as in her power was the design of Cœlebs. Since fiction must be read, she sought to furnish a model which would not necessarily bring corruption in its train. She had perhaps another object in view, to furnish her own idea of a female character, perfectly qualified by education for the duties of life. Brookes, a neglected, but one of the most elegant writers in the language, had long before written a novel, in which religion and moral principle were made to form the active impulses which should operate in life; and which, principally owing to the pains which the venerable founder of Methodism took to make its excellencies known, is still extensively read and admired. Mrs. More's work became equally popular; several large impressions were soon sold in England, and not less than *twelve* in America on the first year of its publication. It falls not within our scope, at the present time, to pass a general opinion on this kind of reading. Unhappily such works as Cœlebs and The Fool of Quality are not frequent. *Religious* novels we decidedly condemn. In 1811 was published her Treatise on Practical Piety. This is an admirable and an evangelical work. She addressed it, to use her own words in the preface, 'as a Christian who must die soon, to Christians who must die certainly.' As she approached the close of her life this excellent writer seemed to have become more and more estranged from earth, and more and more impressed with the vital necessity of religion. Accordingly few didactic works of this size enforce its duties in a clearer or more explicit manner; all minor subjects and consi-

derations are forgotten in the earnestness and zeal with which she presses the 'one thing needful.' Soon after this appeared her 'Christian Morals,' which may be considered as a part of the other; and, in 1815, the 'Essay on the Character and Practical Writings of St. Paul,' generally considered, though at the age of seventy, as her *chef d'œvre.* In 1819, her last work, 'Modern Sketches,' was published; which for undiminished vigor of intellect may be well considered a prodigy: in it she gave that beautiful character of George III. which has been so generally admired. This catalogue of Hannah More's works, though it has necessarily consisted only of their names, will establish for their author in every mind a loftiness of reputation which would need no other praise. Who of this age can point to what they have done, and say they have exceeded her? or, in future times, who will be looked to with more reverence for the earnestness and zeal with which great talents and opportunities were devoted to the cause of religion?

We must now bring this lengthened subject to a close. The greater part of the second volume is taken up with matter of high and deep interest to the religious reader; but affording little capable of being extracted in a notice like the present. During the remainder of her life she was principally confined to her delightful residence at Barley Wood, engaged in the composition of those noble works which will remain lasting monuments of her unequalled powers, and memorable exemplifications of the value of sanctified genius. One by one, the many friends, whose acquaintance shed such a brilliant light over the commencement of her career, dropt off, and left her at length alone—the last of that 'shining circle,'—a link that bound a present age with a past. Her sisters too, the loving and the loved, each after the other disappeared; and in a ripe, yet green old age, Hannah More was left, the last of her era—the last of her race. Yet she found herself not alone in the world—a generation, trained to virtue by her precepts, had grown up in the nation; and every grade bore its tribute of respect to the sage who had instructed them. The voice of grateful praise was wafted to her solitary home from distant nations; and her progress to the tomb was watched, with anxious solicitude, by thousands of sympathizing hearts, in every part of the world. Thus honored and thus regarded, her own conscience void of offence, and her soul ripe for heaven, Hannah More sunk at last into the grave—more unanimously revered—mourned—blessed in her life, her death, her labors, than perhaps any individual of the present century.

Before we close our article, we cannot fulfil our intention without examining more particularly what were the peculiar merits of her character, and the influence of her writings. In an age of clashing interests and rival reputations, the inquiry will be necessary.

Hannah More was, in all respects, one of the most extraordinary women of her age. Placed by her talents in its foremost rank, and influencing thousands and tens of thousands by her writings, she has employed her ascendency to purposes the loftiest and the purest to which talent ever was consecrated—and saw her reward, even before her death, in the wide veneration which was attached to her name, and in the marked and mighty influence of her writings, both in the old world and in the new.

What was that influence? There are surely shades in the beauty

of immortality; and that genius which is directed to the noble ends of purifying the heart, and elevating the understanding—to disseminating religion, and preparing the minds of the young and susceptible for the most important duties of this world, by sanctifying all impulse with the aim and object of a better—which tends, in fact, in the best of ways, to meliorate mankind, by giving the control of all action to religious principle—is certainly entitled to more lasting and grateful remembrance, than all the brilliant imaginings that ever were conceived. English literature, in the nineteenth century, has been adorned with many illustrious females. In history, in fiction, in tragedy, in poetry, it has produced women worthy of all admiration, who have achieved the highest honors enchanted popularity could bestow, and silenced for ever the point, mooted by jealous and ungenerous schoolmen, of the comparative inferiority of the female intellect. Joanna Baillie, Mrs. Opie, Mrs. Bray, Miss Edgeworth, Lucy Aitken, Mrs. Macauley, Mrs. Jamieson, Mrs. Somerville, and a host of others, have trod every walk of genius, and tried and excelled in every grace of the wide diversity of talent.

But, Hannah More, with a reputation and with powers equal to any of them, has a glory peculiarly and distinctly her own. After her first celebrated and successful essays, its brilliant fame, its assured success, its tempting facility, allured not her strong mental powers into the fascinating walks of fictitious writing, or the more solid and elegant paths of discursive literature. Her situation and her reflective mind had opened to her the new, interesting, and all-important field which lay before her, in the direction and proper culture of the female intellect; and her resolution once taken, to that one purpose she bent all the energies of her capacious and extraordinary mind. Nothing ever tempted her from the execution of the severe and mighty duty she had imposed upon herself; while her elegant taste and matured understanding gave a grace and charm to the literature she almost created, which rendered it unnecessary for its votaries ever to wander from its precincts in search of other beauties than its own.

Religious writing had long been left in the hands of professors or enthusiasts; and had been lamented, by the most eloquent of its advocates, as being often the most dull and unreadable of all human compositions. Hannah More, if she did not remove the reproach, has at least the eminent merit, that it applies not to any of her productions. Religion indeed, or the duties connected with it, are the invariable subjects of her compositions. But her style has an unaffected ease, and an unconscious elegance, and is relieved by so many happy touches of genius—such various illustration—such gems of rare and accurate thought—and such an entire earnestness and simplicity, that it beguiles us on from truth to instruction, and pleases, while it improves. One peculiar and marked feature, in all her ethical writings, is their dignity. She never forgets that she is talking to accountable beings of their immortal interests. There is throughout the severe tone of the mentor; but the beautiful benignity of the goddess in disguise, takes all irksomeness from the attitude, and gives us the full benefit of authority, without the awe of being governed. There is likewise more depth of thought in her works than they seem to have received credit for. Her mind was richly stored with the treasures of ancient and

modern knowledge; and her own strong intellect supplied a richness of observation which continually strikes us. The treatise on Practical Piety, and the Remarks on the Character of St. Paul, are works never surpassed in all these particulars, and which add to the treasures of the age. But 'Cœlebs' is the theatre where they are displayed to most advantage. In that charming novel will be found more practical wisdom, and more of the philosophy of character, and of the poetry of observation, than could be collected from all the religious fictions that ever were written.

It has been justly and beautifully remarked, that the bright and proud intellectual pre-eminence of England and America was owing to the long-continued influence of evangelical doctrines upon the national character. It is the case; and if we were asked for the author whose writings are the best exemplification of that influence, we would point to Hannah More. She is the representative of the embodied evangelical character of her country. In her literary capacity, she seems a personification of that Spirit which lighteneth the nations—some higher impulse appears to guide her pen—some holier inspiration to breathe upon her thoughts; and every production is distinguished and sanctified by an evident purity of object and design, which the worldly wise have never known, and the worldly learned have never attained.

In contradistinction to this view of Hannah More's literary character, a striking parallel will be found in one brilliant spirit, who, of another nation, and of far different principles, was the representative and the crowned queen of all that literature which is based upon human science alone. To couple the names of Hannah More and Madame de Stael might, at first view, seem to be preposterous; but, taking each in the light in which we place them, as representing the peculiarities of national genius, and their very dissimilarity will show a marked and useful comparison. Each had a mind capable of the highest flights; and in each that mind was cultivated with the most assiduous care. The genius of each found vent in many voluminous productions: but the one had all Europe for her admirers—the other, but a small portion of the English public for her readers.

The author of 'Corinne' dazzled the world, not less by her melting imagination, than by her profound disquisitions on political philosophy. She analyzed the springs of national greatness, and investigated, with the spirit of a legislator, the character of every people in Europe: and in her elegant chateau of Coppet, with her theatre, and her museum, enjoying her unrivalled reputation, and receiving the homage of genius from every clime, she might be said to rule and regulate the whole republic of letters; for to her sex none could refuse that distinction, which others might have contested with her intellect. Yet, with regard to the permanent utility of her writings—with regard to the advantage of her labors—to the lasting good she has effected—how can she compare with the unpretending mistress of Barley Wood cottage! Each had a mind of the first order. The one was filled with all the knowledge of the world, and enjoyed the highest celebrity the world can give; the other was rich in that knowledge which maketh wise unto salvation, and consecrated it to the service of her Maker. Its fruit was gloriously manifested in the moral improvement, to a great

degree, of her own sex, and will reap the nobler reward of proving, for generations to come, of lasting benefit to others!

How high has been the destiny of this gifted woman! Honored in her own country by all ranks, from the monarch on the throne to the peasant in the cottage, who was instructed by her labors, she has given a new and lofty object to the education of her sex. Yet while, in all her works, she never forgot that they were females, she made it a severer duty always to remember that they were Christians; and advancing with that spirit of calm and high philanthropy, which has characterized the age, she has elevated religious literature above the warfare of sects, and the niceties of polemics, to an equal rank with every other, in a time when science and imagination have alike achieved triumphs unknown to former periods.

This slight, and not over-drawn sketch of her character, will explain how glad we are to have any connected view of Hannah More's life and labors; and we accord the work before us the merit of saying, that of these it gives a faithful and most interesting picture—extended though it be, it will not be the less acceptable to the religious public here, where her instrumentality to good has not been less perceptible than in her own country. Had we space, it would have afforded us much gratification to have extracted much from this volume for our readers. It is rich, beyond any work since the letter-writing age of Johnson, in correspondence with the most distinguished persons of her time; many undeveloped treasures of characters, who will live to all time, are here brought to light, and confer an immense value on this work; which, beside illustrating the life and labors of Miss More, sheds a thousand subsidiary lights upon her character from the fame of others, and admits us to the knowledge of a mind of such godlike usefulness, and to literary exertions of such unlimited excellence, that we never have been more delighted with the perusal of any publication.

We understand that the eminent publishing house, who have got up this valuable work with such unusual beauty and cheapness, are about to issue a uniform edition of all Hannah More's works in a single volume. They could not, in their peculiar line of business, confer a greater boon upon society at large; and we trust that an ample sale of that and the present volumes will encourage them in undertakings of such benefit to the community.

On the publication of the volume we have mentioned, we will, probably, embrace such an appropriate opportunity of giving our critical opinion, at length, upon the writings of Hannah More.

SAMUEL DALY LANGTREE.

For the Methodist Magazine, and Quarterly Review.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

[IT will be perceived from the following remarks, that the author of the Essay disclaims having intended to plead for theological *schools*, but only to show the importance of theological *learning*. So we

understood him at the time we published the Essay, that is, in the objectionable sense in which the author of the 'Strictures' understands theological schools; and hence, as before observed, we think he misapprehended the doctrines of the Essay, and treated them with unnecessary severity. Whatever may be the fate of the question, which has elicited so much warmth—and we shall neither enter into its discussion ourselves, nor allow others to pursue it farther, either here or in the columns of the Advocate—we hope that the efforts making in favor of theological and general education will be encouraged, and crowned with success.

We think, moreover, that the same justice which required us to admit the Strictures in our pages, requires the admission of the following reply; and also, that every writer or speaker has the right of explaining his own meaning, and especially when he thinks himself misapprehended.

For these reasons, though we have no wish to continue the controversy, and much regret the character it has assumed, we cannot deny to brother Sunderland the privilege of speaking for himself, especially as he has said nothing here in favor of the disputed question. No antagonist, therefore, must expect to be heard in its opposition.]

Mr. Editor,—The 'Strictures,' which appeared in the last number of your Magazine, written by David M. Reese, M. D., very forcibly remind me of a circumstance which occurred in the vicinity of Boston, Mass., a few weeks ago. The Rev. Mr. T. was giving a public lecture on the subject of slavery; and, in the course of his remarks, he was led to mention some prisons which are in certain parts of this country, and the purposes also for which they are used. Just at the moment when the speaker mentioned the word 'prisons,' an Irishman passed the door of the church, and the sound of '*prisons*' breaking upon his ear, he immediately seized a brick-bat, and, rushing into the broad aisle of the church, threw it with tremendous violence at the speaker's head. As soon as the commotion had subsided a little, this true son of Erin was asked the reason which led him to commit such a rash act of violence. 'Why,' said he, 'and ye know that he was *praiching* against the *prisons* of the *holy inquisition!* and how could I bear all that?'

So it seems, the writer of those 'Strictures' has read the 'Essay on Theological Education;' and happening to find in it the phrase 'theological seminaries,' he takes fire in a moment, and, without waiting to ascertain my real object in referring to that kind of seminaries, he rushes upon the author with great force, and denounces, in unmeasured terms, his 'truisms,' 'oracular announcements,' 'high misdemeanors,' 'egregious mistakes,' 'impious sentiments,' and 'heavenly-looking heresies!' And I candidly confess, that I should as soon have expected a brick-bat hurled at my head for preaching the simple truths of the Gospel, as that one could have been denounced in this way, merely for advocating the cause of *education* and *intelligence*. But then, I consider the admission of those 'Strictures' into the Magazine, as the

highest evidence, perhaps, which the editor could give of his candor, and his willingness to have every thing said which those wished to say who were opposed to his views on the subject of theological seminaries; and I venture to add, that no one article was ever admitted before, into any one of our periodicals, which differed so widely from the editor's views, in some respects, at least; as I am certain, that I never read one which was preceded and followed by so many editorial caveats and disclaimers, in which a solemn conviction is more than once expressed that the writer of those 'Strictures' totally *misapprehended* the design of the Essay, and that his remarks, to a great extent, were '*wholly uncalled for, and unjustifiably severe.*' Indeed, that the whole of those 'Strictures' were 'uncalled for,' to say nothing of the *spirit* and *manner* in which they are written, I believe every candid reader must have seen, who ever took the pains to read my Essay; and for this obvious reason, I would not now take the trouble to write one word in reply, were it not that my *silence* might be construed, by some who never read the Essay, and who are not acquainted with its author, into a tacit admission that the charges are true, either in whole or in part, which are brought in those Strictures against it. But though, as I have stated before in the Advocate and Journal, that Essay was written without the most distant idea of its ever being made more public than when it was at first read to a few of my brethren in the ministry; yet I do not believe, that one person out of a thousand who ever perused it, has received the impression from any thing which he found in it, that it was the author's design to prove that men 'may be made ministers, the same as men are made merchants and mechanics,' without being called by the Holy Ghost to this work.* Such a thought never entered my heart, till I found it in the Strictures of D. M. Reese, M. D. I never said this; I never wrote it; I never said nor wrote any thing which, by any honest rules of interpreting another's language, could be made to imply this! Never! And the reader shall see, presently, with what fairness, with what candor, with what Christian courtesy,

* It is certainly not a little singular, that the author of these Strictures should discover a kind of 'anti-Christian,' anti-Methodistical, 'heavenly-looking heresy,' 'in fact and form,' throughout that Essay, when no other reader ever even suspected it! Before that unimportant production went to the press, it was read in the hearing of Dr. Fisk, president of the Wesleyan University; Dr. Olin, president of Randolph-Macon College; Dr. Bangs, and the Rev. Messrs. Durbin and Merritt, editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal; each of whom expressed his unqualified approbation of the doctrine advocated in it. And the reader already knows, that it was printed under the eye of Dr. Bangs, with whom the author had frequent conversations on the subject, at the time; but he never discovered the 'heavenly-looking heresy,' it seems, and this he positively declares in his preface to the 'Strictures.' And Dr. Fisk, Dr. Olin, and the Rev. Mr. Merritt had the kindness to read that Essay themselves, immediately after it was printed, but before it was published; and after doing so, each of these respected brethren expressed his approbation of it to the author personally.—Now, though there is nothing in the Essay itself of any importance, otherwise than it is designed to set forth the claims of a most interesting subject; yet I think I may suppose, without the imputation of vanity or presumption, that, had there been any thing in the Essay even looking like 'heresy,' some one of these brethren would have detected it. Were they not as competent of doing this as the writer of these Strictures? And even if the author had never been encouraged to lay it before the public by the approbation of such men in the Methodist Episcopal Church; yet, since it has appeared in one of our principal periodicals, 'their silence speaks aloud.'

the author of the Essay on Theological Education is assailed in those 'Strictures,' as a '*heavenly-looking heretic*,' uttering '*impious sentiments*,'—an '*adversary to Methodism*,' '*quarrelling with the Discipline*,' and dealing in '*truisms*,' and '*egregious mistakes*.'

But, in defending the doctrine, however, which is advocated in that Essay against this assailant, I might, perhaps, as well confess, at the outset, that I shall labor under a manifest disadvantage in the view of all such (if any there be,) who may have been influenced by those Strictures to believe, that my views on the necessity of clerical *intelligence* are, in any respects, exceptionable; for, however 'heretical' and 'impious' I may be in some of my 'sentiments,' or however 'egregious' some of my 'mistakes' may have been, I cannot feel myself at liberty to deal out these and similar epithets upon any one, who may differ from me in opinion, or however much it might seem to me that such a person deserved them.

The object of the Essay, under notice, is thus expressed on the first and fifth pages:—*It was to show the importance of 'a theological education, an education expressly adapted to the work of preaching the Gospel;'* and in applying the subject to the Methodist E. Church, it is stated, page 6, *distinctly* what is meant by a *theological education*:—It is *an education which may, in some sense, 'qualify such to preach the Gospel,* AS THE M. E. CHURCH BELIEVES THE HOLY SPIRIT CALLS TO THIS WORK.'

Here the reader will perceive, that in no equivocal language, and upon the very threshold of the subject, the Essay places the *call from the Holy Spirit*, to the work of preaching the Gospel, before the *education* for which the author argues in the pages of the Essay which follow!

The Essay commences with referring to the *general sense* which the great body of the Christian Church has entertained from the earliest ages, that some such education was necessary; and then comes the following inquiry, which fixes and determines the design of what follows:—

'Why has the M. E. Church never made any provision for qualifying such to preach the Gospel, as she believes the *Holy Spirit calls to this work?*' It is true, that a limited course of study is now generally required of persons *on trial* in our conferences, after they have entered the ministry; [that is, after they have joined the annual conference;] but my inquiry is, why no kind of study, either literary or theological, has ever been required, either in the Discipline or general usage of the Methodist Church, as a requisite for persons, [such as are mentioned above, *called of the Holy Spirit*,] before they commence in the actual service of God's 'sanctuary?'

And then, to this very paragraph, it is added in a note, 'that, since this Essay was written, a course of literary and theological study had been specified by two conferences, which all persons must have pursued before they could be admitted on trial in those bodies.' And then again, on a succeeding page, speaking of a society which had been formed in the New Eng. conference for the purpose of aiding suitable persons in obtaining a theological education, lest I might, perhaps, be misunderstood by any one, I remark:—☞ 'Observe, the object of the above-named society *is not to make ministers*, but to assist such in preparing for the work of the missionary enterprise, either as preachers or teachers, as God may *call to this work*.' And in another note, I

add, again, 'The *object* of this society is to assist such as *God may call* into the missionary field in obtaining an *education* suitable for this work!'

Nor is there one paragraph, nor one sentence, nor one word, nor even one letter, nor comma, in that Essay, which, by any consistent rules of interpreting another's language, can be made to mean any thing contrary to the foregoing quotations. Its design was to show, in some small degree, the great importance of intelligence in the Christian ministry, and some of the reasons why every minister of the Gospel should be 'thoroughly furnished for his work:' it was not written to show what constitutes a *call* from the Holy Spirit to the work of the ministry, but to exhibit some of the responsibilities which such a call imposes upon all such as are favored with it. Why, the very title of the Essay shows what the subject is upon which it is written: it is a theological education—such an education as gives one whom *God* has *called* to the work of the ministry a knowledge of his work, and the most appropriate means by which it may be accomplished. To show the importance of such an education, the Essay states, 'that the Bible and ecclesiastical history unite in the testimony, that, by nearly every Christian Church, which has ever been distinguished by the Divine approbation, such an education has been considered an indispensable prerequisite for persons entering upon the duties of the Christian ministry.' This is the first sentence which I find quoted in the 'Strictures;' and before David Meredith Reese, M. D., denied it, he should have quoted it correctly. However, he meets me with this very modest argument—'these broad and *unqualified* declarations are *utterly unauthorized* and *unfounded!*' It happens, however, that my statement is not unqualified, as the reader will see by looking at it; and whether it is *utterly* unauthorized and unfounded or not, we shall see directly.

It is not a little amusing, I confess, to observe with what a peculiar aptness this writer proceeds to say, that the education mentioned above is 'clearly defined' in the Essay, so that its meaning 'cannot be misunderstood;' and then to prove, that by such an education the author meant 'that a person should be made a minister in a "theological seminary," without a call from God;' he skips over six or eight pages of the Essay, and brings forward three sentences from Dr. Porter! concerning which, he says, 'These sentences, some in *his own words*, and some in the language of another, are here appealed to.' And then, after saying that some of them were my words, and quoting the sentences referred to, he adds, 'The foregoing extracts are quoted from the Rev. Dr. Porter!' But it seems that D. M. Reese, M. D., was so 'zealous' to defend something, or to say something against the 'egregious mistakes' of another, that he forgot to correct his own. And this is the way in which the writer begins his 'Strictures' on my Essay! He first quotes a sentence from it incorrectly, which he denies, without offering one word in evidence of his assertions! Then he quotes and *transposes* three sentences from Dr. Porter, and, referring them to the author of the Essay, says, 'Some of them are in his own words!' And thus, it is proved, that the education contended for in the Essay is 'none other than a plea for "theological seminaries!"'

But is there a sentence in that Essay which goes to say, that 'an

education expressly adapted to the work of preaching the Gospel' cannot be obtained without a theological seminary? Not a word of it! The Essay contends for intelligence in the Gospel ministry, that those whom *God calls* to the work of preaching the Gospel should be, according to God's direction, 'thoroughly furnished' for this work. But how this 'thorough furnishing' can be best obtained *is another question* altogether; and one which is not discussed in that Essay! Hence the very first inquiry made in the Essay is in the following words:—'But how can one teach what he himself has never learned? How can any one learn without study? And how can any one study to any good purpose, without having the necessary means and time at his command?' And the whole drift of the Essay, from the first to the last, was to show, that persons, called of God to preach in the M. E. Church, should have the necessary means and time for study, before they are admitted on trial into our conferences; for this most obvious reason, that they cannot so well have them afterward.

Now, reader, how do you suppose the author of the Strictures proves that I have committed an 'egregious mistake,' in saying that 'the great proportion of the Church of God, from the earliest ages, have not differed, materially, either among themselves, or from the Mohammedans, Jews, and even the heathen, as to their sense of the *importance* of *knowledge*, in all persons previously to their becoming ministers of religion?' This statement, you will have observed, does not say, nor is said any where in the Essay, that all religious teachers, among the Mohammedans, Jews, and heathens, or even among Christians, have had the knowledge here spoken of; but all have, in some way or other, manifested their sense of its *importance.*

But this statement, David M. Reese, M. D., meets with a sneer, and brands it with falsehood, as '*utterly* unauthorized and unfounded!' To prove this statement, I referred to the Bible, and quoted the chapter and verse; but the author of the Strictures says, 'I shall *waive* this reference!' I quoted an extract from Dr. Goodwin and Richard Watson to prove the truth of this statement; but David M. Reese, M. D., says, 'This is too *puerile* to need refutation!' I also referred to ecclesiastical history, to the theological schools established at Alexandria, Cesarea, Antioch, Edessa, and a few other places; I referred to Eusebius, to Clement of Alexandria, to Origen, and others, to prove what I had said; but all these references, says this writer, 'are equally irrelevant, as *every* reader of their history well understands!' What a very convenient way this is to convict another of 'egregious mistakes,' and statements which are '*utterly* untrue!' However, I shall wait till the author of those 'Strictures' has read the histories and the works above named, before I attempt to offer any more evidence of the truth of what I have said.

And here my remarks in reference to those Strictures might have an end, were it not for a few other 'impious sentiments' and 'high misdemeanors' and 'egregious mistakes,' preferred against me by this writer.

1. To show with what fairness he quotes other parts of my Essay, and withal how *correctly* he represents my meaning, take the following:—'He,' that is, the author of the Essay, 'affirms, that John Wesley "was made a minister, precisely as the education societies make

ministers at the present day." ' Now the reader must observe, that this is quoted from my Essay, by this writer, expressly to prove, that Wesley, in my opinion, was made a minister by education *merely*, without his being called of God! But my Essay reads thus:—'It is true, as Newton says, "*None but He who made the world can make a minister.*" But, then, who will pretend to say *how* God shall *make His ministers?* The truth is, *God will have His own way of calling and fitting men for the work of the Gospel ministry;* nor can there be any reasonable doubt but that He ordinarily does this through the instrumentality of His Church; and it does not alter the case at all, whether suitable persons [that is, such as God calls,] are led into the Gospel field through an education society, or a quarterly or an annual conference. Was not Wesley *called of God to preach?* and yet he was made a minister in the very same way, both by the *Divine* and human *agencies*, precisely as the education societies [and annual conferences] make ministers at the present day.'

Such, reader, is the very language, from which David M. Reese, M. D., attempts to show, that I said that neither the venerable Wesley, nor any of his coadjutors, were really called of God to preach the Gospel! Such is the language of the Essay, from which this writer takes some dozen or fifteen words, to prove that *I* affirm, that Wesley was made a minister without his being called of God!

2. Look at the following extract, also, from the pen of him who *sneers* at some of the statements in the 'Essay on Theological Education,' as 'oracular announcements,' and 'egregious mistakes;' who so dexterously '*waives* all reference' to the Bible in support of them, 'as forced' and far-fetched; who deems 'all reference' to profane and ecclesiastical history 'as *too puerile* to need refutation.' This writer says,—

'Indeed, the "superior learning and *extraordinary qualifications*" of both the teachers and students of scholastic divinity, in *any* of the ancient or modern schools, *have never been rendered a blessing* to the Church, nor have *any* of them been distinguished for ministerial success or usefulness in the Church of God.' This is an 'oracular announcement,' surely, with a witness! And before the writer stops to take breath, he adds:—'It is a well-authenticated fact, that these very persons'—observe, these very persons whom he acknowledges have had 'superior learning and *extraordinary* qualifications'—'have been the *greatest drones* in the Gospel ministry, *idlers* in the vineyard, *useless* cumberers of the ground, who ever afflicted and cursed the Church.'

But does not this writer affect to make us believe, throughout his 'Strictures,' that whoever has the call from the Holy Spirit, or, in other words, the *extraordinary* qualifications of a minister of the Gospel, will be more or less useful? And does he not repeat it over and over again, that the author of the Essay *denies* the extraordinary call and qualifications which all true ministers have? And yet he here, with one dash of his pen, utterly disfranchises thousands of such, whom he himself afterward acknowledges God has called, both from 'modern and ancient schools!' Really this exceeds the story of the two vipers, which, in a violent contest, swallowed each other *entire*, so that nothing was left of either!

3. David M. Reese, M. D., says, that, 'in the minutes of one of Wesley's earliest conferences, we have the following explicit declaration of his views on the subject of the call and *qualifications* for the ministry,' and which 'has been incorporated unchanged into our own book of Discipline.' (See Dis. ch. i, sec. 10.) In this statement, however, there are two errors; but, whether they are 'impious,' or 'egregious,' or 'heretical,' I leave the reader to judge. The writer says, the views of Wesley and our Church are given in the rule to which he refers on 'the call and *qualifications* for the ministry;' but there is not one word in this rule concerning the qualifications for the ministry. The rule lays down the evidences by which we are to judge of a person's call to the work, not of his qualifications; and David M. Reese admits, that some are called who are not qualified, as we shall see in the sequel. But why is not this rule quoted correctly, in these Strictures? As it comes from the pen of this writer, it neither agrees with the Discipline, nor Wesley's minutes.

4. The writer of these Strictures prefers one of his charges, it seems, against the lamented Richard Watson; and, according to his showing, this eminent servant of God was guilty of an 'egregious mistake,' also, if not of an 'impious sentiment,' in saying, that it appeared from some extracts which he quoted from the unpublished minutes of Wesley, that the venerable founder of Methodism had fully made up his mind, at one time, to establish what he called a "seminary for laborers." I referred to this fact simply to show the deep sense which Wesley always felt of the necessity of intelligence in the ministry, and that neither he nor any of his coadjutors were ever prejudiced, in any degree, against a 'theological education;' and, as farther evidence of this fact, I referred also to the 'Wesleyan Theological Institution' which has recently been established by the Wesleyan Methodists in England. I observed, 'A writer in the Wesleyan Meth. Mag. for May last, speaking on this subject, says:—"The most prominent feature of the proposed institution, and that which forces itself upon the attention, is, that, so far from its involving any thing new in Methodism, which might endanger its great first principles, the design itself is decidedly Wesleyan. By an extract from the unpublished minutes of conference, quoted by Mr. Watson, it appears to be clearly proved, that Mr. Wesley had, on one occasion, fully made up his mind to establish what he termed a "seminary for laborers;" and that his design failed to be carried into effect, simply because it appeared at that time impracticable to find a tutor competent to conduct such an establishment."' This statement from the Wesleyan Mag. David M. Reese, M. D., flatly denies; and says—'I maintain, that the idea of theological seminaries *is* something new in Methodism, and that it is an innovation upon the original plan of Mr. Wesley!' But which the reader will believe, whether the author of those Strictures, or Richard Watson and the Wesleyan Meth. Mag., it is not necessary for me to stop here to inquire.

'With respect to Mr. Wesley's "seminary for laborers," it will not be pretended,' says this writer, 'that, had it been established, it would have borne any the least resemblance to a "theological seminary," such as that contended for in the Essay.' But the Essay does not *contend* for a theological seminary of any kind; the Essay contends

for intelligence in the Christian ministry, for an 'education expressly adapted to the work of preaching the Gospel;' and all that is said in the Essay concerning theological seminaries is said incidentally, and by way of illustrating the main object of the writer; and, as an evidence of this, it may be mentioned that the extract from the Wesleyan Mag., and the one from Dr. Porter, were incorporated into the Essay more than three months after it was written. And yet David M. Reese, M. D., seizes on three mangled sentences from the language of Dr. Porter to prove that the whole Essay is 'none other than a plea for theological seminaries;' and the remarks of Dr. Porter, from which I quoted, were never designed as a 'plea for seminaries,' particularly, of any kind, but they were written 'on the cultivation of spiritual habits, and progress in study!'

5. It is really ludicrous to observe how this writer argues about 'educating men *for* the ministry, and *in* the ministry.' What the Essay means by educating men for the work of the Christian ministry has already been shown; it is the affording 'such as the Church believes the Holy Spirit calls to this work the necessary means and time for study.' The knowledge which all such ought to have of the nature of their calling, and of the Holy Scriptures, I still say, in my opinion, is indispensable; and Wesley himself says this. He declares, in no very obscure language, that '*no one can take one right step without it*;' that without this knowledge 'there can be no hope that one will discharge his office well,' or 'acquit himself faithfully of his trust.'

But this writer finally admits, that men may be 'educated *in* the ministry;' he admits that the Wesleyan Methodists have now a 'seminary for educating men *in* the ministry;' and he farther admits, that, possibly, it may be well for the Methodists in this country to do something 'by and by' for the purpose of 'educating young men,' not *for* the ministry, but '*in* it.' Very well; and when young men are educated *in* the ministry, pray, what will they be educated *for?* What will be the motive in giving them an education? Will it be to fit them *for* the work of the ministry, or *for* something else? 'O,' says the writer of the Strictures, 'their education, in this case, will follow their *call* to the ministry, and not precede it; their education, in this case, will not be substituted for a call from the Holy Spirit.' Very good; but who ever supposed that an education should be considered as a call from God? Not the author of that Essay. I never said this, nor any thing which could be honestly made to imply it! Never! But I will allow this writer all the credit that he could desire for his 'brief Strictures,'—which, by the way, however, are longer than the Essay upon which they are written,—while he argues in this way against an education for the ministry, possibly, he did dream that such 'Strictures' from *his* pen would be deemed 'too puerile to need refutation!'

6. In the Essay it is stated, that 'a person's being *moved by the Holy Ghost* to call sinners to repentance, does not *qualify* him, in every sense of the word, for the most successful performance of this work.' For this statement, however, the writer of the Strictures manifests no sort of fellowship. Hence he says,—'If this sentence means to recognize a Divine call to the ministry at all, it would leave us to infer,' that he who is thus *moved*, is to understand himself to be called of God to preach, *not now*, but by and by.' Then David M. Reese believes,

when one is *called of God to preach*, that *call qualifies* him, in every sense of the word, for this work! So much to the credit of 'zeal for the Church!'

Now, compare the above with another part of these Strictures, where it is said, 'If any of our conferences had a list of junior preachers in reserve, *for whom there was no field of labor*,' they should be put upon 'a course of study!' Alas! what will not a man say out of 'zeal' against 'heretics' and 'theological seminaries!' What! does this writer suppose, as he tells us here, that God calls men to preach for whom there 'are *no fields of labor?*' Must 'such as are *qualified, in every sense of the word*,' to preach the Gospel, by their call to the work, *wait* for a field of labor, when more than *two thirds* of the world are destitute of the Gospel.

And look, again, at the following:—'If any of our junior preachers who apply unsuccessfully for admission into the itinerancy, because there are *no* circuits or stations, should go, as *they ought to do*, to any of our seminaries or colleges for the *improvement* of their minds in *literature* and *theology*, would not the Church sustain them, and rejoice in it?' No! Never! Never! God forbid, that the Church should ever undertake to *improve* the minds of such as are already '*qualified* to preach the Gospel, *in every sense of the word*,' by sending them to a seminary or college! And, beside, how could our young men be taught the knowledge of *theology* in any of our seminaries or colleges, which are purely literary? For, says this very writer, 'if any one of our infant colleges were known to be not *purely literary*, or suspected of deteriorating into a theological school, it would be impossible to avert from it swift and certain destruction; for it would be utterly abandoned by the Church.' And but a little before he tells us, nevertheless, that, 'if some of our junior preachers were to go, as they ought to do,' in certain cases, 'to our purely literary seminaries, to be taught a knowledge of *theology*, the Church would sustain them, and rejoice in it!' Such, reader, is the reasoning of one, who charges another with uttering 'truisms,' and 'egregious mistakes.'

7. The following sentence from the Essay is quoted by this writer, and from which he labors hard to distort it into slander against the Methodist E. Church:—'Why has our Church never made any provision for qualifying such to preach the Gospel as she believes the *Holy Ghost calls to this work?*' Now, here the reader will perceive, my own words are quoted by this writer, in which it is distinctly affirmed that the education on which the Essay is written was designed, not as a substitute for a call to the 'ministry, but for the farther *qualification* of such as the Church believes the Holy Spirit calls to this work!' How, then, I might ask, in the exercise of common honesty, could any one take the Essay, which was written upon this very question, and quote these words, and at the same time attempt to wrest a meaning from them which they never were intended to convey! Nay; a meaning which they cannot be made to convey, without doing violence to all consistent rules of interpretation!

I need not here stop to show that our Church *never has* made any such provision as is here spoken of, in opposition to the assertions of this writer. This is fully and sufficiently done by the editor, in a previous number of this Magazine; but I believe, that every reader of

this work will say, that I am called upon to justify myself against the 'high misdemeanor' which is here laid to my charge.

The paragraph in my Essay, which contains the 'libellous' sentence, reads thus:—'Now it is very true, that the history of the M. E. Church, as well as the history of the Wesleyan Methodists in England, will show, that the Methodists as a people, *have never been so very indifferent in the cause of general literature and education*, as many have imagined. The schools established in the British connection, as well as *the fourteen seminaries and six colleges*, established by them in the United States, will show this; and *never, perhaps, was the prospect brighter for the cause of education among us, as a people, than it is at the present day.* But has the M. E. Church any usage or practice, in any department of her membership, from which one might be led to infer that an education of any kind is indispensably necessary, before one can be licensed as a preacher of the Gospel?' And to show, what I supposed might be considered one probable reason, why no provision had been made by this Church for affording a suitable education to such as she believes the *Holy Ghost calls* to the work of the Gospel ministry, and, consequently, one reason why we have no rule in our Discipline for the usage or practice above noticed, I said:—'No satisfactory answer to this inquiry can be given from the fact, that the Methodist Church, from the first, has not produced some of the *most eminent* men for *science* and *theological learning*. This the world knows, or ought to know, she has done. And, by the way, perhaps this very fact may be one considerable reason why the Methodists, as a Church, have never felt more than they have the importance of *some* kind of a theological education, in all such as seek her approbation as ministers of the Gospel. We know, that a few have struggled into the lights of science and education, without the direction or any kind of assistance from the Church; and so we have unconsciously imbibed the idea, that *nothing* is either due, or ought to be expected from the Church;' and hence we have *no rule* in our Discipline which makes education of any kind a preliminary to one's being licensed to preach the Gospel, and go out into the world, 'in the awful and responsible office of a public teacher of Christian theology.'

Now, gentle reader, it is concerning the self-same language, which you have just read, and the views therein expressed, that David M. Reese exclaims—'What a *picture* is here drawn of our Church and ministry, by this junior preacher! We marvel that he was not conscious of the gross *injustice* he has thus done to his own Church, and to his senior brethren!' Alas! for the author of that fugitive Essay! How could he be so stupid as not to perceive the *gross injustice* he was doing the M. E. Church, when he declares, that the history of the Methodists in both hemispheres will show, that *they have never been indifferent in the cause of general literature and education!* And what a picture he gives of our ministry, when he declares, that some of them have been the most eminent for their attainments in *science and theological learning!* How 'libellous!' 'Here then,' says the author of these Strictures, 'here then, we take occasion to say, that this WHOLE REPRESENTATION is as *unjust* as it is *unkind!*' And then he begins a tedious course of reasoning to show, that there is a rule *some where* in the Discipline which requires an *education* in persons, before they can be licensed to preach!

'Such are the clouds which intercept the light,
Hang o'er the eyes, and blunt the moral sight!'

But suppose I were to allow, that the rule to which this writer refers, and which says that one must have '*gifts*' before the Church will believe that he is called of God to preach; suppose, for argument's sake, I were to allow, that these 'gifts' meant, as this writer contends, 'an education of some kind;' and that those who possess them must have 'read, at least, one book,' and acquired a 'knowledge of the first principles' of English grammar? Why, it would follow from this, that 'an education' must *precede* a person's call to preach the Gospel; and it does undeniably follow this writer's showing in this place; and this, too, in direct contradiction of the whole drift of his Strictures, that by this rule of Discipline, the Holy Ghost calls no one to the work of the ministry who has not 'some kind of an *education*;' because it is of the evidence of a person's call, alone, that the rule speaks in the Discipline! So this writer, in his great 'zeal for the Church' and against 'heretics,' has arrived at this conclusion, that 'an education of some kind,' according to Discipline, must precede a person's call from the Holy Spirit to preach the Gospel! Hence, he says, 'Will the writer of the Essay pretend, that these "gifts" will appear in those who have never read "a single book," not even the Bible, nor acquired a "knowledge of the very first principles of their vernacular tongue?" And yet these are the very "gifts," by which we are to try every candidate for license to preach, if we are governed by our Discipline.' Here, then, we have David M. Reese's comment on the rule of Discipline by which we are to 'try those who think they are *moved* by the Holy Ghost to preach.' The Discipline says, that all who are called of God to preach have certain 'gifts.' This means, says David M. Reese, that they should, among other things, know how to 'read in the Bible,' at least, and that they should have some 'knowledge of the first principles of their vernacular tongue!' Really, I believe, the reader will not find 'heresy' in the 'Essay on Theological Education' equal to this! The doctrine of the Essay is, that the call from the Holy Spirit to preach the Gospel, makes it one's duty to obtain an education, or such knowledge as is 'expressly adapted to the work of preaching the Gospel,' and without which, Wesley says, '*no preacher can take one step aright.*' But, in these Strictures, David M. Reese attempts to force upon the Essay a meaning which, he thinks, is 'heretical,' 'impious,' 'anti-Christian,' and 'anti-Methodistical;' and, in his 'zeal' to do this, he finally arrives at this very singular conclusion—viz. That an ability to read, and some knowledge of English grammar, is an 'indispensable pre-requisite' to a person's being called of God to preach the Gospel! Now, whether there be any thing 'heretical in fact and in form,' or whether there be any thing 'impious,' 'anti-Christian,' and 'anti-Methodistical,' in all this, let the reader judge.

And here, I will take occasion to say, that I do not recollect of ever having read any thing from the pen of one who made any pretensions to intelligence of any kind, which, to my mind, contained so many palpable contradictions, so many evident discrepancies with itself, so much perversion of another's language, and so much unfair reasoning, as I find in these Strictures. With the author's motives in writing them, I have nothing to do; but with his language, his arguments, his manner

of reasoning, I have something to do. When a member of the Methodist E. Church, and one, too, bearing her authority as a public teacher of religion, lays to my charge, as this writer has done, the crime of 'heresy in fact and form,' and accuses me of 'inveighing against the Discipline' of the 'Church of my choice,' uttering 'inexcusable and egregious mistakes,' and 'impious sentiments,' it seems to me, that with an article containing such charges as these, I have something to do. *Fatetur facinus is qui judicium fugit.* Surely, if another does the mischief, it is not for me to bear the blame.

8. Another assertion to be noticed in these Strictures is in the following words:—'Methodism, from the beginning, has denied the doctrine of this Essay, that a literary or theological education is an "indispensable pre-requisite," or an essential qualification, in any aspect. This is apparent from the writings of Wesley, Fletcher, Clarke, and Watson; and with equal pertinacity and uniformity in our own country, by Asbury, Cooper, Bangs, and Emory—all of whom have expressed themselves unequivocally upon this subject.' Now, does the reader fail to see, how flatly the above contradicts what this writer has said before in his explanation of the word 'gifts,' in the rule of Discipline? There he says a person must have so much of an *education* of some kind, as to be able 'to read,' and understand 'the first principles of his vernacular tongue,' before he can be licensed to preach according to the Discipline; but here, he says, that '*no* kind of an education is necessary or essential, *in any aspect!*' And, to support himself in this contradictory position, he appeals to the writings of both the living and the dead!

It was certainly a felicitous circumstance, that 'Wesley's Appeal to the Clergy' was placed in juxtaposition with the Strictures, which contained such a reflection on the character of that venerable man. A more clear, Christian-like, and ample refutation, of such an unjust imputation, so far as Wesley and Methodism are concerned, could not be desired. And was it in that 'Appeal' that Wesley said, that neither 'a literary nor theological education' was even an 'essential qualification, for a minister of the Gospel, *in any aspect?*' Was it when he said:—'As to *acquired* endowments, can he take one step aright, without a competent share of knowledge?—a knowledge first of his own office—of the high trust in which he stands—the important work to which he is called? Is there any hope that a man should discharge his office well, if he knows not what it is?'

Was it when he said:—'No less necessary is a knowledge of the Scriptures, which teach us how to teach others? Ought he not to know the literal meaning of every word, verse, and chapter; without which there can be *no firm foundation* on which the spiritual meaning can be built? Has he such a knowledge of Scripture, as becomes him who undertakes to *explain* it to others? Has he a full and clear view of the analogy of faith, which is a clue to guide him through the whole? Is he acquainted with the several parts of Scripture, with all parts of the Old Testament, and the New? Does he know the grammatical construction of the four Gospels—of the Acts—of the Epistles? and is he a master of the spiritual sense, as well as the literal, of what he reads? Does he understand the scope of each book, and how every part of it tends thereto? Has he the skill to draw the natural infer-

ences deducible from each text? Does he know the objections raised to them, or from them, by Jews, Deists, Papists, Socinians, and all other sectaries, who more or less corrupt or cauponise the word of God? Is he ready to give a satisfactory answer to each of these objections? And has he learned to apply every part of the sacred writings, as the various states of his hearers require? And as to his intention, both in undertaking this important office, and in executing every part of it, ought it not to be singly this, to glorify God, and to save souls from death? Is not this *absolutely* and *indispensably necessary*, before all, and above all things?'

Was it in such language as this, reader, that the pious, learned, venerable, and ever-to-be-remembered Wesley, declared '*unequivocally*,' as this writer says, that no education, or knowledge, either literary or theological, was 'an essential qualification' for 'a person entering upon the duties of the Christian ministry, *in any aspect*.'

Again: Dr. Clarke is here appealed to, and made to say, that no 'education, either literary or theological, is essential' for candidates for the Gospel ministry, 'in any aspect.' But when did Dr. Clarke utter such a sentiment? Was it in 1806? when he said,—'We want some kind of seminary for educating such workmen as need not be ashamed. I introduced a conversation on the subject this morning; and the preachers were unanimously of the opinion, that some strong efforts should be made, without delay, to get such a place established. Every circuit cries out, "Send us acceptable preachers." How can we do this? We are obliged to take what offers. The time is coming, and now is, *when illiterate piety can do no more for the interest and permanency of the work of God, than lettered irreligion did formerly.* Speak, O speak speedily, to all our friends! Let us get a plan organized without delay!'

This extract from Dr. Clarke, I gave before in the Essay under notice, not as 'a plea,' however, 'for theological seminaries,' particularly, but as an argument which I supposed would have some weight in favor of a *theological education;* and little did I suspect, that any Methodist could be found in this country who would take occasion to say, with this extract before his eyes, that its venerable and learned author declared 'unequivocally' that neither a 'literary or theological education was an essential qualification in *any aspect*,' for 'a person entering upon the duties of the Christian ministry!' Nor does it cover up the error committed in this assertion for the writer to add, that each of the persons whom he enumerates consider 'human learning as a secondary qualification—an auxiliary, truly desirable in the work of the ministry.' Nay, it makes the former statement more inconsistent still; for, if they did not consider either 'literary or theological learning an essential qualification, in *any aspect*,' for persons just entering upon the responsible duties of the ministry, how could they consider human learning merely 'an auxiliary truly desirable,' afterward, when such persons had already entered into the actual service of the ministry? Does one that is young and inexperienced need less learning, less qualifications, when commencing in this work, than when he has been actually engaged in it fifteen or twenty years?

To any one who has attentively read the Christian Advocate and Journal, for a few years past, as well as the previous numbers of the

Methodist Magazine, and the very last number of the Meth. Mag. and Quarterly Review, it will easily appear how very unfortunate this writer was, in referring to Dr. Bangs and others, as a justification of his assertion. Who has forgotten the 'Letters' of Dr. Bangs to young ministers, and which were published years ago? And how could one speak more explicitly than this venerable servant of the Church does, in the very last number of this Review, upon this subject? Nor can I omit this opportunity of saying, that I shall always bear in my soul a most grateful recollection of the early, and, I may add, the successful efforts of Dr. Nathan Bangs to advance the cause of education and intelligence in the ministry of our Church.

And I might quote also from a number of articles, which have appeared in our different periodicals, bearing the signature of Dr. Emory, which would abundantly show that he also has had, for years, the same objects in view; and that it never was his intention, as this writer says, to be understood as saying, that '*no* kind of learning, either literary or theological, is an essential qualification, in *any aspect*,' for 'persons commencing in the work of the Gospel ministry.' And this I would do, for his sake, and for the sake of the cause of Methodism, if I had the least suspicion that the statement upon which I have been remarking was believed by any one.

9. From what has already been said, the reader will now perceive with what propriety this writer uses the following language:—'Let no one then, believe, from this Essay, that our Church fosters ignorance in her ministry, or that we are unmindful of the value of learning.' See what is said above, 7, where these Strictures accuse the author of the Essay of 'gross injustice' for having said, 'no provision had been made by the M. E. Church for the education of such as she believes the Holy Spirit calls to the work of the ministry;' though at the same time the Essay declares distinctly, that *the Methodists, as a people, had never been indifferent in the cause of general literature and education!*' And that '*many of her ministers have been the most eminent for their attainments in science and theological learning.*' Yet in criticising this very language, David M. Reese says, this was '*gross injustice*,'—and 'this *whole* representation is as *unjust* as it is *unkind!*' And now, to complete the climax, he cautions the world against supposing, from the Essay which contains such language, that 'the Methodists are unmindful of the value of learning!'

10. Again: look at this:—'We hold *no fellowship* with the doctrine, that when called of God to the work' of the ministry, any 'are to excuse themselves from *immediate obedience*, until they shall have gone through a course of study in a theological seminary.' Now compare this with another place in these Strictures, where the author says,—'If any of our conferences had a list of junior preachers, for whom there were no fields of labor, like some on the list of reserve in England, they might be sent to some of our colleges, and the Church would sustain them in it!'

A few more remarks on these singular Strictures and I shall have done.

This writer accuses the Essay with saying, that God has altered the economy of his grace, by which men are called to the work of the Christian ministry! And how do you suppose he attempts to fix this

charge upon a Christian brother? Why, by quoting *a part* of a paragraph, where I make a comparison between the ministers generally, in the days of Wesley, and the ministers of the present age! These are my words, and those which this writer *left out of his quotation* for the purpose of changing the sense are here *italicised*, that the reader may the better distinguish them:—

'But there is scarcely any perceptible similarity between the age in which we live now, and that in which Wesley lived; as little, indeed, as there is to be seen between the manner of God's calling men into the ministry then, and the manner of his doing this now. *The regular and ordinary ministers of Wesley's day were generally backslidden, or such as never possessed the life and power of godliness; and the same remarks will apply to the days of Christ. Hence, God called men in an extraordinary way, to do the work which others had left undone. But it is not true, now, that the great proportion of ministers in this country, who believe the fundamentals of the Christian faith, and who have come into the ministry in the ordinary way, are destitute, as many of their predecessors have been, of the unction of the Holy Ghost. This is not the fact.*'

Now, why did this writer so *cautiously* leave out the words I have marked in this paragraph; dismember a sentence, and wring out of it a sense which he must have known the writer never designed? Is this the way to prove a man 'guilty, both in fact and form, of heresy?'

And what is the plain, unsophisticated meaning of the above language? Why, simply this; that there are many more ministers in the Protestant Episcopal Churches, and among the Presbyterians and Congregationalists of the present day, who have been called of God, and anointed of the Holy Ghost to preach the Gospel, than there were in the days of Wesley. And I am exceedingly sorry to find that any one, who claims relationship with the great Methodist family, should, in any way, deny this; and much more so, when I find such a one setting down the whole of these ministers, almost without discrimination, as 'the *greatest drones*, *idlers*, in the ministry,—who have *never been made a blessing to the Church*;' and '*useless* encumberers of the ground, who glory in their theological training instead of the cross of Christ.' I repeat it, I am pained to find such assertions made by any professed lover of Methodism, and I pity any one who could allow himself to write in this way. But as these remarks were not commenced with the design of noticing every thing in those Strictures deemed incorrect, or as the editor himself has judged them, 'uncalled for,' and 'unjustifiably severe;' I think it is not necessary longer to tax the reader's patience; and with a word concerning the opposition which this writer informs us is felt by some of our people against education and intelligence, I will add no more. He says: 'There may be found individual members of our Church, who really think it a sin for a preacher to look into a dictionary or English grammar, and who would lose all faith in a minister who used a Greek Testament, especially if he were college bred.' 'There may be,' but *are* there any such in the M. E. Church? Now, if there be such persons in our Church, who think it a sin for a preacher to be properly *informed* and *intelligent*, how came they by such views? Did they re-

ceive them from 'Essays' written and published by our preachers 'on theological education?' Did they receive them from any efforts which have been made by our preachers or people to advance the cause of education and general literature among ourselves or elsewhere? Are these views the legitimate fruits of Methodism? NO! These singular views, with which it would seem this writer is acquainted, never were derived from the Discipline of our Church, which makes it the duty of every Methodist preacher to preach *expressly* on the subject of *education*; they were never derived from the teachings of Wesley, nor from the prudent teachings of any of his real followers; nor from any of our books or periodicals. Whence, then, did these singular views originate? It is a remarkable fact, that the preachers of the M. E. Church, as a body, have done more by their own contributions and personal exertions, to advance the cause of education, for fifty years past, (every thing else considered,) than the same number of preachers in any other Church in this country! And yet there are 'some of our people who think it a *sin*' for a public teacher of religion to 'look into a dictionary, or an English grammar, or to read in a Greek Testament;' and who would 'loose all faith in one who had been college bred!' This is mortifying surely; and hence this inquiry becomes so much the more important: What has been the cause of such views among our people? I will not believe that any Methodist preacher either entertained such views himself, or that any one ever designedly communicated such views to others. But have *none* of us *ever* written or spoken against a 'theological education,' in such a way that we may have been understood to be speaking or writing against being 'college bred?' Have none of us ever done any thing which looked like opposition to learning and education? Who among us has ever said that 'the superior learning and extraordinary qualifications of both teachers and students of scholastic divinity, in all schools, both ancient and modern, *have never been rendered a blessing to the Church of God?*' Who among us has said, and proclaimed it in one of our standard periodicals, as a 'well-authenticated fact, that *the greatest drones in the Gospel ministry, idlers in the vineyard, and useless cumberers of the ground*, who now *afflict* and *curse* the Church, are among those who have an *education*,' and who, of course, look into a dictionary, and read also in the Greek Testament, and have been 'college bred?' Who, among us shouts an alarm at a feeble and 'puerile' attempt to advance the cause of education among the 'junior preachers' of our Church? Who has denounced an 'Essay,' written and published for this purpose, and one too, as 'puerile' and feeble as it confessedly was, which had been approbated by some of the most pious and intelligent men in this Church? And who, in his zeal to do this, has said,—'I choose to incur the hazard of being excluded from the company of the most enlightened, pious, and useful members of the Church!' Who has classed the author of an 'Essay,' simply designed to promote the cause of education and intelligence among such as are 'entering upon the duties of the Christian ministry,' with the 'adversaries of Methodism;' as 'forming a league with our enemies,' and guilty of 'heresy in fact and form,' uttering doctrines which are 'anti-Methodistical' and 'anti-Christian?' Who has denounced such an attempt as 'a *dangerous* and *ruinous innovation?*'

Innocent, indeed, he may have been, and his motives as pure as an angel's in heaven; he may have succeeded to his heart's content, in convincing his readers that he has said all this, and much more like it, out of a 'conscientious regard for the Church of his choice;' but surely, he need not marvel, nor need he be at the pains to tell others of the fact, that he has some in his congregation of hearers, and in the company of his acquaintance, 'who really think it a sin for a preacher to look into a dictionary or English grammar, and who lose all faith in one who has been college bred!'

LA ROY SUNDERLAND.

February 20, 1835.

AN EXEGESIS OF HEB. VI, 4–6.

BY THE REV. GEORGE PECK.

Heb. vi, 4–6. 'For *it is* impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, and have fallen away, to renew *them* again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put *Him* to an open shame.' (*Wesley's Translation.*)

'For IT IS impossible *to renew again, by repentance*, those who *have been* once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and *have been* made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the *age which was* to come, *and yet have fallen away;* crucifying again in themselves, and making a public example (for this translation of παραδειγματεζοντας, see Matt. i, 19,) of the Son of God.' (*Dr. Macknight's Translation.*)

'For it is impossible that they who have been once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and been made partakers of the Holy Spirit, and have tasted the good word of God, and the influences of the world to come, and have fallen away, should be again renewed to repentance; since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God, and openly exposed Him to shame.' (*Professor Stuart's Translation.*)

THIS passage has been variously interpreted, according to the theological notions of critics and commentators. By divines of the Arminian school, it has commonly been considered as unequivocally asserting the possibility and danger of falling finally from a state of grace. By Calvinistic interpreters a variety of constructions has been put upon it, to make it harmonize with their doctrine of the infallible and unconditional perseverance of all those who are brought into a gracious state.

Some of these critics maintain, that all the high attainments set forth in the passage come short of a real state of grace; only implying such an illumination, and such gifts and endowments, as may be possessed without genuine love to God. Others, that, though a genuine state of grace may be set forth, yet the *impossibility* of renewal to repentance is not to be understood of an *absolute* impossibility, but as only expressive of the *extreme difficulty* of the case. Others, that it is only impossible *with men;* or that it would be impossible for the *apostles* to renew them, but that still *God* might and would do it. Others, with Beza, resort to a bare-faced interpretation, inserting the particle *if*—'*If* they shall fall away.' These are followed by the translators of our present authorized version. But the last construction we shall notice

is, that the apostle does here speak of a fall from a genuine state of grace, and that the *impossibility* of their being renewed is to be taken literally and absolutely; but that this does not prove that any who are embraced in the covenant of grace, *will* ever so fall as to be lost; God having secured their final perseverance, in part at least, by means of those very threatenings.

In the investigation of this subject, we propose to see upon what grounds each of these theories rests. In the philological part of this discussion, we shall make use of Professor Stuart's note upon the passage, as he has furnished us with a clear, and, in general, correct developement of the doctrine of the passage, and a triumphant refutation of all the above schemes of explanation, except the last, which is his own.

This gentleman is known as 'professor of sacred literature in the Theol. Sem., Andover, Mass.,' and as the author of many literary and theological works of high order. His commentaries upon the books of Romans and Hebrews have attracted the notice of some of the most eminent critics, both in this country and Europe, and unquestionably evince deep thought, profound erudition, and great diligence. As he is a professed Calvinist, and as he refutes the exegesis of most of the divines of his school, who have gone before him; and in fact, concedes to us every thing material to our argument from this passage, we shall introduce his note at length. Considering the result of his investigations, as somewhat more valuable from the fact, that he is forced upon them by a philological investigation of the language; and that deference to the opinions of his brethren, and a regard to the trust-worthiness of his theology as a Calvinist, would have made it desirable, if possible, to arrive at different conclusions.

'(4.) Αδύνατον γαρ, *for it is impossible*, i. e. we will go forward in the attainment of what belongs to Christians, and not recede; *for it is impossible*, viz. that those who recede and apostatize should be recovered from their lapse, as the sequel avers. In this method of interpretation, the meaning of γαρ is sufficiently evident. But does αδυνατον here imply *absolute* impossibility, or only *great difficulty?* The latter, Starr and many other critics reply. To vindicate this sentiment, they appeal to Mark x, 25, 27, and to the parallel passages in the other evangelists. But this appeal is not satisfactory. In Matt. xix, 23, and seq.; Mark x, 23, and seq.; Luke xviii, 24, and seq. (all relating to the same occurrence,) Jesus is represented as saying, "πως δυσκολως, shall a rich man enter into the kingdom of God!" He then adds, "It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God." His disciples are astonished at this, and ask, "*How is it possible* that any one [any rich man] can be saved? τισαρα δυναται σωθηναι." Jesus replied, "With man this is αδυνατον, [impossible;] but with God all things are δυνατα, [possible.]" Surely He does not mean merely that this is *very difficult* with men, but that it is absolutely *beyond their power* to accomplish it.

'The other examples of the use of this word in the New Testament are not at all adapted to favor the exegesis of Starr; e. g. Acts xiv, 8; Rom. viii, 3; xv, 1; where the word, however, is figuratively employed. But if the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews is to be com-

pared with himself, then is it quite certain that αδυνατον will not bear the qualified sense which Starr puts upon it. Compare Heb. vi, 18; x, 4; xi, 6; all clear cases of *absolute impossibility*, not of mere *relative difficulty*. These are all the instances in which the word is found in the New Testament. Nor will a resort to *classic* usage any better defend the interpretation of Starr.

'Beside, if it could be shown that such a qualified sense were agreeable to the *usus loquendi*, in some cases, and therefore *possible*, a comparison with Heb. x, 26–31 would destroy all appearance of *probability* that such a sense is to be admitted here. If there remains no more sacrifice for sin (Heb. x, 26) for those who have apostatized, then is there no hope of salvation for them; as is clear from Heb. x, 28–31. Moreover, to say merely that it is *very difficult* to recover the lapsed Christians, of whom the apostle is going to speak, would be at variance with the imagery employed to describe them, and the fate that awaits them, ver. 7, 8. For all these reasons such an explanation of αδυνατον cannot be admitted.

'Τους ἅπαξ φωτισθέντας, *those who have been once enlightened*, i. e. instructed in the principles of Christianity. So φωτιζει, in John i, 9; Eph. iii, 9; Heb. x, 32. In all the other passages of the New Testament where this word occurs, it is employed in the sense of *shining upon, throwing light upon, disclosing*. It does not, in itself considered, imply *saving* illumination, but illumination or instruction simply as to the principles of the Christian religion.

'Γευσαμενους τε της δωρεας της ἐπουρανίου, *and have tasted of the heavenly gift*. Γευσαμενους, *tasted*, does not mean *extremis labris leviter degustare*, i. e. merely *to sip*, or simply *to apply for once to the palate*, so as just to perceive the taste of a thing; but it means the *full enjoyment, perception*, or *experience* of a thing. When the Greek writers wish to communicate the former idea, they add χείλεσιν ἄκροις to the phrase; e. g. They are witnesses, οἱ μὴ χειλεσιν ἄκοις γευσα μενοι της φιλοσοφιας αλλα . . . ἐστιαθεντες, *who have not only tasted with the extreme part of the lips* [*sipped*] *philosophy, but . . . feasted upon it.* (*Philo. lib. i, de Monarchia*, p. 816.) So Chrysostom, ακροις τοις χειλεσιν γευσασθαι, (*Hom. on Johan.* v, 19.) But when a *full* experience or perception of any thing is meant, γευομαι is used simply; e. g. οἱ γευσάμενοι της ἀρετης, (*Philo. de Abraham, oper. i*, p. 14.) So του θανατου γνωσεως γευσασθαι, (*Clem. Rom. i*, 38.) In the New Testament, θανατουγευσθαι, [*to taste death,*] means *to experience death*; e. g. Matt. xvi, 28; Mark ix, i; Luke ix, 27; John viii, 52; Heb. ii, 9. Compare also Luke xiv, 24; 1 Pet. ii, 3. So the Hebrew טעם, [*to taste,*] Prov. xxxi, 10; Psa. xxxiv, 8.

'But what is the *heavenly gift* which they have enjoyed, or the benefits of which they have experienced? Some have explained it as being Christ himself, by comparing it with John iv, 10. But it is doubtful whether δωρεαν, *gift*, there means Christ. It is more probable, that it means *beneficium*, i. e. the kindness or favor which God bestowed in vouchsafing an opportunity to the Samaritan woman to converse with the Savior. Others have represented δωρεαν, as being the extraordinary gift of the Holy Spirit to Christians, in the primitive ages of Christianity; and they have compared the phrase here with πνεῦμα αγιον, [*Holy Spirit,*] in Acts viii, 19, which means the special gifts of

tho Spirit, and which, in viii, 20, is called την δωρεαν του θεου, [*the gift of God.*] But the objection to this is, that the sequel of our text contains a *repetition* of the same idea, once at least, if not twice. For these reasons, I prefer the interpretation which makes δωρεαν επουρανιου, the same here as κλησεως επουρανιου, [*heavenly calling,*] in iii, 1; i. e. proffered blessings or privileges of the Gospel. The sense is then plain and forcible:—(1.) They have been instructed into the elementary doctrines of Christianity, φωτισθεντας, [*being enlightened.*] (2.) They have enjoyed the privileges or benefits of living under a Christian dispensation, i. e. the means of grace which the Gospel afforded; and this is truly δωρεα επουρανιος. I much prefer this mode of interpretation to any other.' But does enjoying 'the means of grace which the Gospel affords,' merely, come up to the full force of the passage? According to the professor's explanation of γυσαμενος, *tasted*, must not the passage imply an *actual experience* of the power and efficacy of the Gospel? Or, as says Dr. Clarke, receiving '*the knowledge of salvation by the remission of sins*, through the day spring from on high which has visited them.'

'Καὶ μετοχους γενηθέντας πνεύματος ἁγίου, *and have been made partakers of the Holy Spirit.* I understand this of the extraordinary gifts and influences of the Spirit which the primitive Christians enjoyed, and which were often bestowed by the imposition of the apostles' hands. Γενηθεντας is a more unusual word, in such a connection as the present, than γενομενους; but still there are sufficient examples to show, that occasional custom sanctions the use of it in such cases as the present.

'(5.) Καὶ καλον γευσαμενους θεοῦ ῥῆμα, *and have tasted the good word of God*, i. e. enjoyed the consolations administered, or the hopes excited, by the Divine promises which the Gospel proffers. Γευσαμενους, as above, *experienced, known by experience.* Above, it is construed with the genitive after it; here with the accusative, both according to Greek usage, although the former method predominates. Καλον ... θεοῦ ῥημα, *the Divine promise* i. e. of good. So דבר טוב [*good word*] means, in Prov. xxix, 10; xxxiii, 14; also Joshua xxi, 45; xxiii, 14, 15; in which last sense it is opposed to דבר רע, [*evil*, or *bad word,*] *promise of evil, commination.* Καλὸν ῥῆμα means *the word which respects good*, i. e. the promise of blessings or favors. So Paul calls the Gospel, επαγγελίαν θεου εν αὐτῶ το ναι, [*the promises of God in him,*] 2 Cor. i, 20. I prefer this simple method of explanation to all others. The gradation, moreover, of the discourse is more perceptible, than if ῥῆμα be here construed as indicating merely επαγγελιον, which would make the whole clause to signify nearly, if not exactly, the same as ἅπαξ φωτισθεντας, [*once enlightened,*] or, at least, as γευσαμενους δωρεας ἐπουρανιου, [*tasted of the heavenly gift.*]

'Δυναμεις τε μελλοντος αἰῶνος, *the powers,*' (or, as the professor translates it,) '*the influences of the world to come.*' After mentioning with disapprobation the explanations of Raeinoes and Bretschneider, our author proceeds:—'Others give it the sense of miracles, &c; for such a sense of δυναμις, [commonly rendered *mighty works,*] is frequent in the New Testament; see Matt. vii, 22; xi, 20, 21, 23; xiii, 58; Mark vi, 5; Luke x, 13; Acts ii, 22, &c. But how will this differ much, if any, from the sense given to μετοχους ... πνευματος αγιου? It is truly a difficult phrase; and, on the whole, I feel inclined to give it the

following sense, viz. *the influences of the world to come*, i. e. of the Gospel dispensation; see chap. ii, 5. There can be no doubt that δυμις means *influences*, i. e. virtue or power exerted, etc. I take it here in its most general sense, and so as comprehending whatever good or beneficial influences the particulars already named did not comprise.

'Thus interpreted, there is a regular gradation in the whole passage. (1) They had been taught the principles or doctrines of Christianity. (2) They had enjoyed the privileges or means of grace, which the new religion afforded. (3) Various gifts and graces had been bestowed on them by the Spirit. (4) They had cherished the hopes which the promises of the Gospel inspire. (5) They had experienced those powers or influences, by which the Gospel was shown to be a religion from God, and adapted to render them happy. Thus they had the *fullest* evidence, *internal* and *external*, of the Divine origin and nature of the Christian religion. Consequently, if they apostatized from it, there remained no hope of recovery.

'(6.) Και παραπεσόντας, *and have fallen away, have made defection from*, viz. from the Gospel, or from all the experience and evidence before mentioned; παραπίπτω governing the genitive. The connection stands thus:—* *It is impossible for those once enlightened, and have tasted, &c,—and have fallen away*, και παραπεσοντος. In compound verbs, παρα is often taken to denote deterioration. The *falling away* or *defection* which is here meant, is a renunciation of Christianity, and a return to Judaism. This implies, of course, a return to a state of active enmity and hostility to the Christian religion; for such was the Judaism of the times when our epistle was written.'

Upon these words, *and have fallen away*, Dr. Macknight, who is also a Calvinist, has the following criticism:—'The verbs, φωτισθεντας, γευσαμενους, and γενηθεντας, being aorists, are rightly rendered by our translators in the past time—*Who were enlightened, have tasted, were made partakers.* Wherefore παραπεσοντας, being an aorist, ought likewise to have been translated in the past time, *have fallen away.* Nevertheless our translators, following Beza, who, without any authority from ancient MSS., hath inserted in his version the word *si, if,* have rendered this clause, *If they fall away;* that this text might not appear to contradict the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. But as no translator should take upon him to add to, or alter the Scriptures, for the sake of any favorite doctrine, I have translated παραπεσοτας in the past time, *have fallen away*, according to the true import of the word, as standing in connection with the other aorists in the preceding verses. Farther; παραπεσοντας is put in opposition to what goes before in the 4th and 5th verses; the conjunction και, with which it is introduced, must show here its adversative signification, exemplified Eph. vi, 21, *And yet have fallen away.* Wall, in his note on this verse, saith, "I know of none but Beza whom the English translators could follow. The Vulgate hath, *Et prolapsi sunt;* the Syriac, *Qui rursum peccaverunt;* Castalio, *Et tamen relabuntur.* The word παραπεσοντας literally signifies, *have fallen down.* But it is rightly translated *have fallen*

* I take the liberty here to give the translation, instead of the Greek.

away, because the apostle is speaking not of any common lapse, but of apostasy from the Christian faith."'

'Παλιν αναχαινιζειν εισ μετάγοιαν, *again to be renewed by repentance.* Παλιν [*again*] should be joined to ἀναχαινιζειν [*to be renewed,*] not only by common usage in respect to the position of an adverb when placed immediately before the verb which it qualifies, but the sense here requires it. Ruinail says, *Particula παλιν rendundat.* But where he gets any authority for such a construction, in a case like the present, I know not. The writer does not, indeed, mean to say, "Those who have a second time fallen away," but that "those who fall away cannot be *again* or a *second time* brought to repentance." Drusius, Cappell, Abreseh, and others, take αναχαινιζειν here in the passive sense, as equivalent to αναχαινιζεσθαι, and construe it in connection with what precedes in this manner: "It is impossible for those who have been once instructed, etc. *to be renewed* to repentance." The simple grammatical construction of αναχαινιζειν, as it now stands in the *active* voice, is thus: "It is impossible again *to renew* by repentance such as have been once instructed," etc. If the latter method of construing the sentence be adopted, it is natural to ask, Who is the subject of the work, ἀναχαίνιζειν? i. e. who is the agent that is to produce this renovation? Is it God, i. e. the Holy Spirit, or Paul, or others? Bretschneider (Sex.) understands the word in an *active* sense, and supposes that Christian teachers are the agents to whom the writer refers. Starr renders it indefinitely; "Man kann unmöglick neider lessom," *one cannot possibly produce another amendment.* But, instead of saying *one cannot*, in this case, I should prefer understanding αναχαινιζειν in an *impersonal* sense, and rendering it in English by our passive verb; since many verbs used impersonally convey a passive sense. See my Heb. Grammar, sec. 500, note 2.

'There is still another construction which may be made of the passage, and which is a very common Greek one; viz. παλιν αναχαινιζειν τους απαξ φωτισθεντος . . . και παραπεσόντας, αδυνατον, *to renew*, or *the renewal of, persons once instructed, . . . and who have apostatized, is impossible.* In this case the infinitive ἀναχαίνιζειν is used as a noun, and makes the subject of the proposition. This would afford the same sense as that which was last suggested above.

'Εἰς μετάνοιαν, *with respect to repentance;* Chrysostom, Erasmus, and others, *by repentance.* Εἰς with the accusative, sometimes signifies the *manner* or *means*, in which or by which a thing is done; e. g. Mark v, 34; Acts vii, 53. But here it may be translated, *in respect to, with regard to*, a sense which is very common to the word. Construed as it is in the version which I have made, the sense will be, "To renew them so that they will repent."

'Ανασταυροῦντες ἑαυτοις τον υιον του θεοῦ, *since they have crucified for themselves the Son of God.* Chrysostom construes αναστανροῦντας, [*crucified,*] as meaning παλιν αναστανροῦντας, [*crucified again;*] and so our English translators, and many others. But this is not conformable to common Greek usage. Ανα, in composition, merely augments the intensity of a rule, if indeed it produces any effect upon its signification; for sometimes this is hardly perceptible. That the word in question is to be *figuratively* taken is plain from the nature of the case.

Actual *physical* crucifixion is out of the question. It means, then, *to treat with the greatest ignominy and contempt.*

'But what does ἑαυτοῖς [*himself*] mean? It is susceptible of two interpretations: (1) As *Dativus incommodi*, i. e. *to their own hurt, shame*, etc.; so Starr. See Winner's N. T. Grammar, sec. 31, ed. 3. (2) It may be construed as Hebrew pronouns in the dative frequently are, viz. as pleonastic; e. g. לך לך, *go for thyself*, i. e. *go*; בם לך, *he has fled for himself*, i. e. *he has fled*; Heb. Grammer, sec. 545. I incline to the latter mode of explanation. Perhaps the shade of idea is, "*crucify, so far as they are concerned*," or, "they themselves being concerned in the transaction of crucifying."

'Και παραδειγματιζοντας, *and exposed him to public shame*; compare Matt. i, 19. By renouncing their adherence to Christianity, they would openly declare their belief that Christ was only an impostor, and of course that He suffered justly as a malefactor. By returning again to Judaism, they would approve of what the Jews had done; and thus they would, as it were, crucify Christ, and expose Him to be treated by unbelievers with scorn and contumely. Every one knows, that an apostate from a good cause gives new occasion, by an act of apostasy, for the enemies of that cause to utter all the malignity of their hearts against it. In this sense apostates expose the Savior to public infamy, when they renounce all regard for Him, and join with those who view Him as an impostor and a malefactor.'

In his twelfth '*excursus*,' the professor resumes the subject, as follows:—'But does the whole paragraph pertain to real Christians, or to those who are such only by profession? To the former, beyond all reasonable doubt. For how could the apostle so solemnly warn those who are *mere professors* of Christianity against defection and apostasy? Defection from what? From a graceless condition, and a state of hypocrisy. Such must be the answer, if mere professors (and not possessors) of Christianity be addressed. But mere professors, instead of being cautioned against defection from the state in which they are, are every where denounced in language of the severest reprobation. See Rev. iii, 15, 16; and the denunciations of the Savior against the Pharisees.

'Moreover, the language employed to describe the condition of the persons in question, shows that the writer is addressing those whom he takes to be real Christians; e. g. μετοχους . . . πνεματος αγιου, [partakers of the Holy Spirit;] καλον γευσαμενους θεου ῥῆμα, [tasted of the good word of God.] Above all, παλιν ανακαινιζειν εις μετανοιαν, [again to be renewed to repentance;] for how could he speak of being AGAIN *renewed by repentance*, if he did not address them as having been once renewed by it?

'The nature of the crime, too, and the awful denunciation with which it is threatened, shows that something *peculiar* is attached to the case which the writer is describing. Sinners, who have been taught the doctrines of religion, and yet renounced their *external* respect for it, are manifestly not without the pale of God's mercy; at least, they are not so considered in the Scriptures generally, and *fact* shows that they are not. It is a peculiar and aggravated case, then, which is here stated; and what other case can it be, than that of apostasy from a state of saving knowledge of Christ and His Gospel? Nor is such a

case at all without a parallel in the Scriptures. Manifestly such a one is stated in Heb. x, 26–32; also in 2 Pet. ii, 20–22; in Ezek. xviii, 24; xxxiii, 12, 13; iii, 20; and in many other passages of the Bible. It is implied in every warning, and in every commination, addressed to the righteous; and surely the Bible is filled with both of these, from the beginning to the end. What is implied, when our Savior, in his sermon on the mount, urges upon his disciples, i. e. the apostles, as well as other disciples, (see Luke vi, 12–20,) the duty of cutting off a right hand, and of plucking out a right eye, that offends; and this, on a penalty of being cast into hell? (Matt. v, 29, 30.) Is this penalty *really* threatened; or is it only a *pretence* of threatening, something spoken merely *in terrorum?* Can we hesitate as to the answer which must be given to this question?

'But if we admit the penalty to be *really* threatened, then the implication is the same as in the passage before us, viz. that *Christians are addressed as exposed to incur the penalty of the Divine law by sinning.* In our text they are surely addressed as exposed to fall into a state in which there is no hope of renewal by repentance.'

It would seem from the above, that this eminent scholar and theologian had not only fully conceded our exegesis of the text under consideration, but many more of our proof texts; and, indeed, nothing short of the whole argument upon the *danger* and *possibility* of *falling from grace!* But he next makes an effort to save himself; or to avoid the imputation of having entirely abandoned the Calvinistic views of the perseverance of the saints. He proceeds:—

'Whatever may be true in the Divine purposes, as to the final salvation of all those who are once truly regenerated, (and this doctrine I feel constrained to admit,) yet nothing can be plainer, than that sacred writers have every where addressed saints in the same manner as they would address those whom they considered as constantly exposed to fall away and perish for ever. Whatever *theory* may be adopted in explanation of this subject, as a matter of *fact*, there can be no doubt that Christians are to be earnestly and solemnly warned against the danger of apostasy, and consequent, final perdition. What else is the object of the whole Epistle to the Hebrews, except a warning against apostasy? In this all agree. But this involves all the difficulties that can be raised by metaphysical reasonings, in regard to the perseverance of the saints. For why should the apostle warn true Christians, (and such he surely believed there were among the Hebrews, chap. vi, 9,) against defection and perdition? My answer would be: Because God treats Christians as free agents, as rational beings; becanse he guards them against defection, not by mere *physical* power, but by *moral* means, adapted to their natures, as free and rational agents.'

But to this method of evading what appears to us the necessary consequences of his philological investigations, we shall urge two objections. The *first* is, that it involves the professor in inconsistency. It is clearly inconsistent with the sound argument which he has prosecuted with good effect upon another subject of importance. We refer to his argument against Universalism, in his 'Exegetical Essays on the several words relating to future punishment.' In this work he conclusively urges the certainty of the eternal punishment of the finally impenitent, from the legitimate import of the words employed in relation

to that subject; such as, hell, for ever, everlasting, &c. His argument from these words is substantially this, that sinners *are addressed as exposed to final impenitence and an eternal hell.* That *they are threatened with a punishment literally eternal.*

Now supposing a Universalist opponent to reply to his argument thus: 'Though we admit that the sacred writers have every where addressed sinners in the same manner as they would address those whom they considered as constantly exposed to die impenitent, and perish for ever; yet we are constrained to assert that the final salvation of all men is true, in the Divine purposes. And the sacred writers warn sinners against final impenitence and perdition, because God treats men as *free agents*, as rational beings; because he guards them against final impenitence and its consequences, not by mere *physical power*, but by *moral* means adapted to their natures as free and rational agents;'—What would Professor S. say in answer to this? If he were to adhere to his principles, would he not be found to acknowledge, that the threats of eternal punishment he has adduced, after all, fail to prove that any *will finally realize them!*

Dr. Huntington, in his posthumous work, entitled 'Calvinism Improved,' admits the *full force* of the terms which Professor S. examines; and yet attempts to prove the final salvation of all men on the principles of substitution, viz. that Christ suffered the whole of the threatened penalty in the sinner's stead, and of course that the sinner could not justly be compelled to suffer it in his own person. Had our professor lived a little earlier, he might have furnished Dr. H. with another argument, with which to avoid the doctrine of eternal punishment, his own philology upon the *strength of the terms* employed, notwithstanding. For, upon the principles of exegesis which the professor adopts, in the case under consideration, the Universalist would completely avoid his conclusions, from the strength of the terms employed in relation to the duration of the threatened punishment. The Universalist might admit all that our author contends for upon this point, and yet the truth of his theory remain unaffected. For he might retort with the greatest propriety: 'Though, indeed, eternal punishment is threatened in the Bible, this by no means proves it will ever be realized. It is indeed one of the means employed by God to serve the purposes of his mercy, in relation to *the whole* of Adam's race. Though sinners "are addressed as exposed to" die impenitent, and be eternally damned, yet "I am constrained to admit, the final salvation" of all men "is true, in the Divine purposes."'

Is there any flaw in this conclusion? And does not the Universalist, upon Professor Stuart's own principles of exegesis, fairly avoid his conclusions, and furnish (if the exegesis in question be correct) a triumphant answer to all that can be urged from the terms which he has examined with so much critical skill; and indeed to almost every material argument to be deduced from the Bible against him? It gives us no pleasure to descant upon the inconsistencies of others under any circumstances, but especially when such inconsistencies are found in those who have rendered important services to the world, and whom we regard as every way, by far, our superiors. But *principle* must not be sacrificed to *men*, whatever may be their standing.

But *secondly*, we object to the exegesis altogether, in both cases.

We are constrained to believe, in relation to the *threatenings* denounced, both against the finally impenitent and final apostates, that there is something fearfully portentous. We believe that there is too much solemnity and severity in these terrible comminations to admit of the idea of a mere *false alarm.* Indeed, the supposition is, in our view, derogatory to the Divine veracity, and would, if pushed to its legitimate consequences, undermine the foundations of our confidence in God, as a being of undeviating sincerity and truth. For if He can threaten what He never will execute, why, then, He can promise what He never will fulfil! and so we would be left without a permanent foundation for our hopes!

In conclusion we can but say, that we consider the case under consideration, one instance among several, in which this eminent linguist evidently flinches at the consequences of his interpretations of Scripture. We do, indeed, rejoice that he so frequently enters into a free and independent discussion of points, which have been so long maintained, and considered as settled, by Calvinistic interpreters; and that he fearlessly dissents from, and ably refutes some of their most objectionable constructions of the sacred text. But we can but regret that his attachment to a 'theory,' and his 'metaphysical reasoning,' should ever so bias his judgment, as to force him into reserves and resorts, which go in any measure to neutralize his labors as a critic.

Auburn, January 16, 1835.

PARAPHRASE ON JOB.

Mr. Editor,—The following paraphrase was written by a member of the Society for the Promotion of Education; and its author intended to have read it at the last meeting of the Society; but was prevented. I have therefore solicited of him a copy for publication.

Marcus.

It is with no small embarrassment that I submit to your judgment the following poetical effort. I am conscious of entering a field where the reapers have been before me, and all that was rich and rare and beautiful has been culled and garnered. Not possessing originality enough to strike out some new path, I have contented myself with taking a sublime specimen of ancient poetry, and adapting it to English metre, and present it, in a modern garb, for your approbation or censure. Any attempt to improve the language of the original would be vain and presumptuous; you will, therefore, perceive that I have adhered punctiliously to the spirit of the poem, as well as the original reading, only varying the phraseology so as to suit the metre. The measure I have selected is the English anapaest, a beautiful specimen of which is Campbell's Lochiel Warning, which approaches nearest to the hemistich of the original. Indeed, the plaintive seriousness, as well as the drag of that measure, is well calculated for the subdued wail of permanent anguish. The translator of the original appears to have glided naturally into this measure, for he opens the lament of Job in that strain: 'Let the day perish wherein I was born,' &c.

I am well aware that a production of this kind is not altogether in keeping with the avowed object of this society, and that to encourage a taste in the membership of the Church for the more useful and practical branches of education is of paramount importance to those minor efforts, that seem but to enrich the fancy, or exalt the imagination. Still there is an error in depreciating poetry too far, or considering it always as subservient or secondary to prose. Poetry is the mother of devotion; it is not merely her handmaid, but it is that which, if rightly directed, invariably gives rise to the soul's 'mysterious longings.' It travels upward; it hath no congeniality with earth; with the lark it ascends, with its matin tribute, to the very gate of heaven—to Him, who is the source, the centre, and the soul of all harmony. All nature teems with poetry, from the faint melody of the purling rill to the rush of the cloud-sprinkling cataract; from the harmonious grove to where sphere chimes with sphere in mystic melody. Wherever in national history, in the record of ages that are gone by, poetry has become a passion, and a pursuit among the citizens of a nation, there its effects are happily evident in the polish of manners, the softening down of asperities and ferocities, the eliciting and drawing out the virtuous and kindred feelings of man's rough nature, the increased respect to private right and public justice. Who shall say that the Iliad and the Odyssey of Homer were not productive of all this, and more? The violation of female honor, of individual right; of hospitality, ingratitude, contempt of the Deity, disrespect to old age, are there visited with such signal retribution, depicted in glowing numbers, and by a master hand, that they could not but have a powerful influence on the morals of a people.

It doth appear to me, that true piety and experimental religion are so intimately connected with the poetic spirit, or, as Racine terms it, the 'genie createur,' that I do not know how it is that, within the pale of our own Church, a poetical taste is so little cultivated, and so little cared for, noted as that Church is for the great stress it lays upon a religion in the soul.

The same reasons for decrying a taste for poetry are in vogue for depreciating devotional and experimental piety, viz. they are both incompatible with the spirit of pecuniary enterprise and gain—that both are inconsistent with that close, suspicious, intriguing spirit, which with some is too much the 'sine qua non' in forming a mercantile character, I readily allow; and Heaven grant they ever may be! The man that would rather sacrifice his integrity than his riches, whose exaltations and depressions are governed only by the state of the money market, would be a cold and indifferent listener to the pathetic and soul-stirring strains of Isaiah; to him the harp of David, though struck by the master himself, would have no charms, while the heaven-towering flights of a Milton would hardly remind him of his own baseness.

A suitable, though not engrossing attention to the laborious and active pursuits of life is not, however, alike compatible with the spirit of genuine piety, as well as the cultivation of a poetical taste. History will furnish us with proofs. Take one of the many brilliant examples from antiquity. King David was burdened with the government and cares of a nation, and a nation of most discordant materials for repose, and quite a stiff-necked and rebellious generation; and yet poetry, music, and devotion was the daily food of his soul, and oft he soothed

the jarring cares of state with Judah's harp, attuned alternately to joy or sadness. We have a long list of names, high in the Church and the state, celebrated for their religious, literary, and temporal labors. Among these may be cited Dr. Young, the Wesleys, Bishop Heber; they were Christian philosophers, poets, and working men. Among statesmen and politicians there is Mr. Canning, the late premier of England, Martines de la Rosas, minister of Spain, both poets of enviable celebrity; Chateaubriand, the minister of Charles X., still living, who stands high on record as philosopher, traveller, biographer, historian, ambassador, statesman, and poet.

I am not one of those who would deny the flights of the imagination when properly directed; and for this reason, their tendency is upward. There is already too much of earthliness in our nature. Whatever unlooses the soul, though but in part, from this tenacious clod, lends it a pinion more to soar away and mingle with the blaze of day.

I have commenced paraphrasing where the poem properly commences, at the third chapter, wherein Job curses the day of his birth, and regrets that he ever saw the light; describes the empire of death, and its inhabitants; regrets that he is appointed to live in the midst of sorrows, for the calamities that he feared had overtaken him.

LET the day perish wherein I was born!
From the days of the year be it blotted and torn;
Shine not upon it, O God! with thy light,
Rest fearfully on it the death stain and blight;
Unrescued, a prey to blackness and gloom,
Be terror its meed, and darkness its doom!
And, as for that day, be it stricken with fear;
No glimmer of light o'er its darkness appear;
Disjoin'd from the days, a curse-stricken thing,
Let no cheerful note o'er its solitude ring;
For it cut me not off in my mother's womb,
But gave me alive to a world of gloom.
Ah! would that my spirit had burst away
The moment it woke in its barrier of clay!
Ah! would that the knees, which refused me to die,
Had fail'd, and the breasts withheld their supply!
For now had I lain composed, unopprest,
In slumber serene, in unbroken rest,
With earth's counsellors wise, the mighty of old—
The strong arm, the valiant, the amasser of gold!
Or else, would to God, as untimely birth
I had dropp'd from the womb, but to moulder in earth!
There on that silent, oblivious shore,
Grades, classes, complexions are thought of no more;
There the wicked for ever have ceased to revile,
And the weary and worn their sorrows beguile!
The poor, the opprest, the slave, with toil spent,
Have forgotten to weep—have ceased to lament!
The high and the low, the small and the great,
Lie blended together in one common fate.

Ah! why dispense the fair light of heaven
To him, whose soul with anguish is riven;
Who long for their death, who covet the grave,
And welcome the signal of its shadowy wave;
Who bend o'er the tomb, with hope-lighted eye,
And ardently ask to sicken and die!
Ah! why am I mock'd with Heaven's blest light;
My way is hedged up, bewilder'd my sight.
With fast falling tears I have moisten'd my food—
My groans are unstay'd, as the swift-rushing flood.
The woes that my soul dreaded even in thought
Are suddenly made my portion and lot;
My bosom was far from anxiety free:
But this is the climax of misery!

CHAPTER XXIX.

Job laments his present condition, and gives an affecting account of his former prosperity, having property in abundance, and being surrounded by a numerous family, and enjoying every mark of the approbation of God; speaks of the respect he received from the young, from the nobles; details his conduct as magistrate and judge in supporting the poor and repressing the wicked, his confidence, general prosperity, and respect.

O! that I were as in days that are past,
When the Eternal arms around me were cast—
When the light of His candle shone bright on my head,
And by its blest beam through the darkness I sped!
O! that the days of my youth would return,
Ere the secret of God from my bosom was torn,
When my Father in heaven was with me to bless,
And my children around to share my caress—
When I wash'd my steps in the butter-milk stream,
And rivers of oil from the flinty rock came.
When I walk'd forth to the citadel gate,
Or my seat prepared in the populous street,
The young men hid away when they saw my face,
And the aged rose up to honor and bless;
The princes were silent, the nobles refrain'd,
While their hands on their lips in deference remain'd.
Honor and gratitude greeted my ways;
The ear heard but to bless, the eye saw but to praise;
For I minded the cry of the wretched and lone,
And the fatherless' wrongs I made my own;
Who were ready to perish I snatch'd from the grave,
And her joy to the heart of the widow I gave.
Righteousness cloth'd me, judgment array'd;
Or like a bright diadem, circled my head.
I was eyes to the blind and feet to the lame,
And boldly I plead the poor man's claim:
But the spoiler I crush'd my feet beneath,
And pluck'd the spoil from between his teeth.
Then I said in my nest I shall flourish and die,
When my days, as the sand of the sea, multiply:

For by the fresh waters my root was spread,
And the dews of heaven my branches fed.
My glory declined not, but flourish'd apace,
And my bow was renew'd in vigor and grace.
When I spake none utter'd their counsel again,
For my words dropp'd down as the latter rain;
And men were bound, as if by a spell,
For never the light of my countenance fell.
I chose out their way, and sat as a chief
While the suppliant sought and obtained relief.

CHAPTER XXX.

Job proceeds to lament the change of his former condition, and the contempt into which his adversity had brought him; pathetically describes the afflictions of his body and mind.

But now they, that are younger in years,
Deride me with scorn, and mock at my tears,
Whose fathers I would have disdain'd to set
With the dogs of the flock, that ate of my meat.
Perish'd in vigor, and weak through infirmity,
Could the strength of their hands have profited me?
Want and famine had made them their own;
In the desolate wilderness was their home.
'Neath the nettle and bramble for shelter they stood,
And the juniper roots were their meagre food.
They were scouted from men, and driven to dwell
In the caves of the earth and the clefts of the hill;
Children were they of fools, base born and bred,
More vile than the earth—more rank than the dead.
And now I am their song, by-word, and reproach!
They spare not their taunts, and are swift to encroach.
With scornful abhorrence they turn from my sight,
Or stay but to heap new insult and spite;
For He hath loosed my cord, made bitter my wail;
Therefore, unbridled, they cease not to rail.
The youth rise against me; they mar my path,
As the out-break of waters that rush in their wrath!
Dismay on me they roll, with anguish I start,
Then languishing sink, as the poor stricken hart.
Swift, as the wind, fresh terrors pursue
Till my vigor is gone, like the morning dew.
At the night-watch my bones are pierced with pain,
And the sinews no respite from anguish obtain.
Debased and degraded He treadeth me down,
And I perish beneath His withering frown.
Stay thy arm! I cry, in my fierce agony;
The wail of my grief riseth up to the sky.
Thou regardest me not; thou art cruel become;
Thy strong hand oppresseth me, feeble and lone:
Thou liftest me up on the driving air,
And I ride the wind till dissolved with fear.

For I know that to death thou wilt bring me soon
To the house appointed, the living's long home.
But not to the grave will thy hand extend,
For there my sorrows will have an end.
Ah! wept I not for the poor man's fate,
And grieved was my soul for the desolate;
But, alas! when I look'd for good, there came
To my grief-struck bosom evil and shame!
I was ready to greet the look'd for light;
And lo! I am plung'd in a darker night!
My bowels boil in me; my bosom is reft;
What solace upholds me—what refuge is left!
With a voice of wo, in the assembly, I cried,
I am a brother to dragons, and with owls abide.
The force of disease hath blacken'd my skin;
A fire is raging my bones within.
As the voice of the weeper, my lute breathes out;
And my harp is struck with a mournful note.

THE COLONIZATION CAUSE.

We give below the first annual Report of the Young Men's Colonization Society of Pennsylvania, together with extracts from the speeches of some Christian gentlemen who addressed the meeting at the first anniversary. This cause has recently received a new impulse; and it will be found, we humbly trust, a safe rallying point for all the friends of African melioration and salvation.

The first annual Report of the Young Men's Colonization Society of Penn.

The God 'who tempers the wind to the shorn lamb,' hath never left the afflicted people of color in this country without warm and zealous friends.

The principles of that man of peace and mercy, William Penn, remained in active exercise among his benevolent followers; and at a very early date we find in Pennsylvania societies for the emancipation of slaves and the relief of free blacks. Immediately after the successful issue of the war of independence, the attention of the freemen of the United States was turned to the evil of slavery, and the unjust oppression of the colored race, in those states where there were few or no distinctions of color recognized by their laws, and all enjoyed the right of freedom. In other states, where the blacks were more numerous, and, of consequence, the difficulties in the way of their relief greater, the friends of humanity were not idle. Dr. Franklin was at the head of an anti-slavery society, in 1787, and similar associations were formed in several other portions of the confederacy. The political sagacity of Mr. Jefferson discovered very early the inconsistency of involuntary servitude with free institutions, and earnestly, but unsuccessfully endeavored to commence its eradication from Virginia.

Notwithstanding, however, the zeal and number of these direct efforts against slavery, and in favor of the colored people, but little was accomplished. The evils which the patriot and the philanthropist deplored continued rapidly to increase. It is true, that in several states a system of gradual emancipation was successfully pursued. Many were delivered from illegal bondage, and more received the benefits of education. Yet mercy sighed for some method of relief more promising and immediate. The intelligent friend of the negro could not but perceive the difficulties, natural, moral, and political, in the way of securing to him all the good which he needed. He knew that the south, excited as well by fear of the physical force of her slave population, as her supposed sense of interest from her peculiar agriculture, must regard with jealousy every attempt

to interfere with her domestic relations. He also knew that the free states could not interfere directly in the matter without a violation of the constitution, nor would they consent to jeopard the integrity of the union and the national safety by the agitation of this exciting topic on the floor of Congress. He was also aware of the jealousy which must ever exist (until perfect holiness subdues all prejudice) between two races, markedly distinct, yet inhabiting the same country; and the contempt with which the descendants of slaves are ever regarded by the offspring of the free. He could also foresee the difficulty of elevating the character—the character of the blacks themselves—while depressed by this load of contumely, and surrounded by all the associations of their former bondage. No sufficient plan for obviating all these difficulties was proposed to the American public until the year 1817, when the American Colonization Society was instituted at Washington.

The idea of colonizing the people of color in the land of their fathers was indeed of a much earlier date. To Mr. Jefferson is, probably, due the honor of the discovery; for so early as the year 1777 he proposed a plan providing, in his own emphatic language, "for the restoration to Africa of her stolen children." In 1787 the British colony at Sierra Leone was established, through the influence of Sharp, Clarkson, and Wilberforce; and excited the attention of several reflecting minds in this country, among whom were Dr. Thornton of Washington, and the Rev. Dr. Hopkins of Rhode Island. Indeed before the year 1800, Paul Cuffee, a negro of great talent, proposed colonization; and subsequently carried out a number of emigrants, at his own expense, but was prevented only by death from seeking, with a large number of his oppressed fellows, a home in Africa. The establishment, however, of the national society first gave to the plan substance and life. It has often been remarked, that when the God of providence intends to employ human instrumentality in some new display of benevolence, he inspires several minds, perhaps widely distant, with the same purpose. This was eminently true of the rise of this enterprise. The Rev. Dr. Finley of New-Jersey, and Elias B. Caldwell, Esq., originally of the same state, had long been revolving in their minds the duty of imitating the God of Israel, in sending forth the oppressed Africans from the land of their bondage to the land God gave to their fathers, and of recompensing that bleeding continent for her wrongs, by the healing influence of the Gospel of peace. These views were communicated to several gentlemen, among whom were the Hon. Elias Boudinot and Gov. Bloomfield, who had discovered by painful experience the inefficiency of mere anti-slavery efforts, in which they have long been engaged, and who heartily coincided in the merciful expediency of the measure. About the same time a distinguished son of Virginia, Hon. C. F. Mercer, whose living merit needs no panegyric, revived the idea of Mr. Jefferson before alluded to, and had already consulted with several benevolent and approving friends. Through the united efforts of these philanthropic individuals the society was formed, having for its distinct purpose "the colonization of the free people of color, residing in this country, in Africa or elsewhere, with their own consent."

In the succeeding year the work was commenced, and, amid innumerable difficulties, has given to the history of the world the most successful instance of colonization upon record. In less than thirteen years, since its foundation, Liberia contains about three thousand free and happy citizens, who have removed from oppression and bondage to the enjoyment of liberal institutions. The slave trade has been utterly destroyed along its entire coast, formerly the most frequented market of human flesh; and missionaries of every leading religious denomination of this country have made it their avenue to the blessed work of evangelizing Africa.

It is not wonderful that many errors and faults have been committed in the prosecution of an enterprise so stupendous and novel, upon a foreign and very distant shore, by an association of individuals. Perfect wisdom and foresight belong not to man. Neither is it remarkable that change of climate, or the circumstances of a new settlement, should produce much disease and death.

Nor should we be surprised that a people so long humbled and degraded, as the colored people of this country, should, many of them, prefer inglorious ease and indolence to the self-denial and courageous adventure of emigration, in search of hardy independence. The long enslaved Israelites preferred to die in Egypt rather than encounter the fatigues and perils of pilgrimage to the land of Canaan.

It is evident, however, that increased vigilance is necessary on the outpost as

well as the citadel of our society. It is also true, that the experience of the past has corrected and enlarged the views of many of the supporters of the cause. The doctrines of temperance and peace are now more fully understood than when our first settlements were formed; and although we cannot compel those who are already in Liberia to their adoption, without a violation of those rights we profess to accord to them, yet we believe the spirit of the age requires some additional care over those whom we are yet to send.

The immensity of the undertaking also led the founders of the society to believe it to be beyond the grasp of private benevolence, and to seek the influence of great names, and legislative aid. This, and the location of the institution in a place so exclusively political as Washington, has excited the anxieties of many excellent and devoted friends of the cause; and, although our allegiance to the parent institution is still unshaken, has induced the belief that the greater prosperity of the cause may be secured by smaller associations, at once independent and auxiliary.

The young men of Pennsylvania therefore united themselves together in the society, whose anniversary we now celebrate; and undertook to carry into effect a permission given by the parent society to the well-known friend of the cause, who is now our foreign secretary, to establish a new colony on the coast of Africa. Our success, even at this early stage of the enterprise, has been beyond our warmest hope, and demands devout thanksgivings to almighty God.

The first impulse given to our efforts was in December, 1834, at a public meeting, our venerable friend and patron, the Right Rev. Bishop White, presiding. When our deceased vice president, whose memory is hallowed in a thousand hearts, and 'at whose death so many good men wept,' the Rev. Dr. Bedell, seconded by the Right Rev. Bishop Doane of New-Jersey, moved that efforts be made to raise the sum of ten thousand dollars for the purpose of founding a new colony.

In April last the Young Men's Colonization Society of Pennsylvania was organized, from the following considerations:—

1st. A belief that a direct appeal should be made to the benevolence and Christian zeal of Pennyslvania, in favor of the establishment of a new colony upon the coast of Africa.

2d. The necessity of prompt measures to carry into effect the will of Dr. Aylett Hawes, of Virginia, by which he manumitted more than a hundred slaves, on condition of their being sent to Liberia.

3d. The carrying into practice in the new colony certain principles of political economy, as the fostering with greater care the agricultural interests, checking the deteriorating influence of petty and itinerant trafficking, maintaining the virtue of sobriety by obtaining from the colonists a pledge of abstinence from ardent spirits; and by withholding all the common temptations and means for carrying on war, or for engaging in any aggressive steps upon the native population of Africa.

How far we have been sustained by the liberality of our friends, our treasurer's report will show; and the account which has been already presented to the public of the sailing of the Ninus, on the 24th October, from Norfolk, with one hundred and twenty-nine emigrants, is a proof that we have not been altogether idle. These, we trust, are but the earnests of our future prosperity.

By a happy arrangement lately concluded with the New-York Colonization Society, the energies of both institutions will be devoted to the prosperity of our infant colony at Bassa Cove; while the interest of the parent board are secured by our pledge to pay into their treasury thirty per cent. of all the collections we may make within the limits of Pennsylvania, which is assigned to us as our field.

Under these circumstances, we feel confident in commending our cause to the good and the wise of Pennsylvania. We believe it to be the cause of mercy and of God. The greator our experience of the effect of colonization, the greater is our conviction of its expediency and virtue. It is the most immediate relief we can give to the colored man, for it removes him at once from the influence of prejudice and oppression.

It has proved itself to be, as colonization has done in all ages, the best method of elevating the negro character by exciting him to virtuous ambition and honorable enterprise. It is the most effectual cure for the slave trade, by the substitution of a benign and liberal commerce for the traffic in human flesh. It is the

best and safest method of promoting every obstacle—obviating every danger—silencing every excuse—and inducing frequent example, more efficacious than volumes of argument or invective. It is the hope of Africa, in opening upon her benighted shores the fountain of life and knowledge.

Our enterprise must succeed. A cause conceived in benevolence, and nurtured by prayer; a soil, enriched by the ashes of so many devoted servants of God and Africa, cannot be given up, and must not be lost. If God be for us, what matter it who they are that be against us.

JOHN BRECKENRIDGE, President.

The Rev. Dr. Tyng, of the Epiphany Church, in West Chesnut-street, then rose and addressed the meeting.

Mr. President,—Although rarely disposed to use the language of apology, yet I feel it due to myself, to the cause for which I am about to speak, and to the audience before whom I stand, to say that I have been brought here to supply the place of another. The Rev. Mr. Breckenridge is detained in New-York by the unexpected death of his child; and I have come (said Mr. T.) in full confidence in your Christian charity, that you will make allowance for my feeble state of health, my total inability to make any preparation for the occasion; and I will make the sacrifice of attempting under these unfavorable circumstances. I am indeed unprepared, without data; but by the peculiar circumstances which I have mentioned, stirred up anew to promote the cause of Christian benevolence, I am ready to offer at this shrine all my talents—it is the cause of humanity—it is the cause of God, whose I am, and whom I serve.

Though most of my ministry has been spent in a slave-holding state, or in that immediate vicinity; yet I have come to the conclusion, that all we can do for benighted Africa—all that we can affect for degraded Africans *here*—is by such efforts as we now are making.

Men, sir, talk of colonization as a new idea; but the whole history of man is a scheme of colonization. Men of old traversed distant regions to make settlements, or to convey doctrines. Paul said, 'from Jerusalem round about Illyricum, I have preached the Gospel;' and what, sir, is all this but colonization?

Colonization furnished our own existence as a Christian people, and as a nation of the earth.

Could I place myself two centuries back on some spot of Europe, and point to the western world, and bid the people behold nations rising up on these distant shores, Churches growing and sending back to the old world the Gospel it had received therefrom, I could show the effect of colonization. We stand now, sir, at the distance of these two hundred years; and now, by our efforts, not one colony alone, but all along the coast of Africa, the American name is known as the governing cause, and the God of nations as the God of Africa.

When all history sustains the principles and facts of colonization, how shall men stand up and oppose colonization on grounds such as we occupy? I feel myself, sir, compelled, by every principle which God has given me, to aid colonization throughout the world.

What, sir, is every missionary effort, but a successful colonization scheme? Look to Africa; from the Cape of Good Hope along her eastern, and up her western coast, and at every line of radiation between, what is every missionary station but a separate colony? And what is the difference in the plan of missionary labors, and this of colonization; but that, in one instance, separate individuals go and carry the principles of truth on which the colony is to be founded; while, in the other case, the people go, and carry out the men and principles? God hath equally blessed both, and opposition from man cannot affect them.

Within a century, the first attempt was made to establish a colony on that part of Africa where the poor, squalid Hottentot dragged out a miserable existence—the lowest in the scale of humanity; and now, sir, what is the case? Look at the missionary records, and they will show that nearly two thousand of these African Christians are now carrying out the principles of colonization, enjoying life as rational men and as Christians.

And, sir, we read delightful accounts of the Bush men, dug out of their caves, and the abodes of filthy wretchedness, now risen to the standard of men, and repaying all efforts for them, by actual contributions to the missionary cause in England. They, sir, hold their monthly meetings of prayer, and participate in

all the arrangements of the Christian world. And yet, with all these facts, we find men—I will not doubt their motives—their consciences I may not judge—but we find them in opposition to the great principles which God has approved as the saving principles of the world. And I believe that young men cannot engage in any enterprise more noble, than in carrying out the Gospel system of diffusing good, as they do in colonization.

I speak not here of the evils of slavery, though I know them all. I have seen with pain and regret, the deep anxiety of the Christian slave-holder for the moral and spiritual welfare of his bondmen; and I have mourned with the slave also, though I have not found among them that degree of misery and unhappiness which is imputed by many to their peculiar situation.

I have seen them sigh for liberty as the bird mourns its confinement—as the unfledged bird beats itself against the bars of the cage, though she could not sustain herself upon the atmosphere with her untried wing. But, sir, here are the very wings furnished to the bird, and here the pure atmosphere for her trial; here is given that liberty for which she sighed.

I leave the question of slavery to other hands. I leave all political questions to others. I look upon this cause as a Christian philanthropist; and in my desire to promote the best interest of slaves, and secure to them their natural rights, I inquire how am I to do this? By giving to them the ability to enjoy their right, and then placing them where they can enjoy it.

Throughout our southern country, there is many a man who daily collects his slaves, instructs them in the great things that belong to their good, and at evening kneels and prays with them himself, or employs a preacher to instruct them in Gospel truth. I correspond, sir, with a gentleman of high standing, (I speak this to illustrate, not boastingly,) who thus devotes himself to the good of those committed to his care, whose efforts God will prosper, though uninformed men may deride them, because they proceed from a slave-holder. Like Cowper, I abhor slavery, and deplore its evils. I know what those evils are; but I know that they are not without alleviation. Colonization will afford a system of alleviation; but this is not all: it will civilize and Christianize a continent. Suppose every Christian had opposed the colonization, what could have been done for Africa? They are the friends of Africa, to whom every regenerated African owes the conversion of his soul.

I know not, Mr. President, how long we may, though our ages are so unequal, be allowed to watch the efforts made by colonization societies. But Africa is to owe all her regeneration to colonization. Should she be left to those who oppose this system, she would come up to the great judgment with her hands stretched out for help, but stretched in vain. Sir, the friend of Africa is the friend of colonization.

After apologizing for my inability to address you at all, it may be wondered that I have addressed you so long; and I should startle at the apparent inconsistency myself, but for the interest of the subject upon which I have been called to speak: but I see a gentleman entering the meeting to whom you will listen with more pleasure. With hopes that the young men will continue their efforts, I conclude with great thankfulness for the patience with which I have been heard in the remarks that I have made.

The Right Rev. B. B. Smith, bishop of Kentucky, then arose and addressed the meeting.

Sir,—As an adopted son of Kentucky, I appear with pleasure before this audience, to bear testimony to the blessed effects of colonization upon slavery where I have been in a situation to make observations.

Some think that colonization has done injury to the slave states. I think differently; and I will detail a few causes for my opinion. For nearly four years I witnessed the operation of this system in Virginia, and I can safely bear testimony to its happy influences there.

People had looked about to see how slavery could be mitigated; they dared not inquire openly; it was talked of in a low voice; public discussion was frowned on. At length a few, a very few, friends of the colored race began to advocate the cause of colonization. Their character caused them to be listened to, and their exertions gradually brought the question before the public; and what is the effect? Throughout that state a feeling has been evinced; and the subject is now publicly discussed even in the legislative halls of that great state;

and many good men have been enabled by this society to do justice to their servants. I have known the sacrifices of the pious, who have almost literally given up their all, in order to send back their slaves to their own land.

But I wished to speak of the effects of colonization in the state of which I am an adopted son. Twelve years since, sir, a clergyman began to speak in that state of colonization; and he was only heard because he was a Virginian by birth, and a Kentuckian by residence; but now discussions are tolerated, which makes our state one of the foremost in the work.

I will, sir, give you the synopsis of one of the best colonization speeches I have ever heard; it was made by a plain working man.

He observed that it had often been said, that the Kentuckians were the best politicians of any Americans of the same intelligence; and this is true. Yet we have now *five* working men standing guard to keep one slave in order; and this was the fact, because slave labor had reduced the character of workmen, and diminished the necessity for labor. For the present, this state of things would be submitted to, but not long. There are only three ways by which we can avoid the evils of slavery—amalgamation, extermination, or colonization. Human nature revolts at the two first, therefore I am in favor of the latter. He might have added a fourth, viz. gradual emancipation; and a great proportion of the people of Kentucky are in favor of that measure. A society has been formed, and each member has pledged himself to free every slave born to him, at twenty-five years of age. The object is, that, at the end of a few years, this society might offer its example to the state, and ask its concurrence. At present the constitution of the state is diametrically opposed to any such measure.

Kentucky, sir, was settled from Virginia, by poor men, who took with them but few slaves; and hence slavery was less strongly established there. The true republicanism of Kentucky dictated to most of these citizens the propriety of seeking some relief for their slaves; and a large number of the most respectable Kentuckians, at the head of whom was the Hon. Henry Clay, asked from the legislature an amendment of the constitution to prohibit the introduction of slaves; but, alas, exactly the opposite was the result; and it was resolved that there should be no legislative action on the subject. But there is a great desire to call a convention on this very question; and last winter a proposition was presented to the legislature of the state for this purpose: it was lost in the senate by a vote of 19 to 20.

Of all the portions of our country, Kentucky has the most reason to deplore the effects of a slave population. Once, sir, the negro ran away from the white man—now the white man runs away from the negro; and the best of our hardy citizens are removing rapidly to Illinois on account of slavery, so evidently injurious to an agricultural country.

I have witnessed in Kentucky the effects of colonization on Christian people; and I know the joy and gratitude of their hearts that such an avenue is open for their relief; and I believe that a system of a series of colonies, devised here, will be seconded in Kentucky, by preparing colonists for their new homes.

The colored population there are a better people than in the south, though certainly not so well prepared as could be desired; yet from year to year many might be sent fully prepared, if colonization societies at the north and east would bear their expenses, to colonies founded on temperance and Christian principles.

Travelling as I do several months every year, through a most magnificent country, burthened with only one evil, the curse of slavery—and witnessing as I do its blighting effects on the slave, and the curse of God on the master—how can I do otherwise than rejoice at any measures for sending the blacks to a place where they can be instructed in Christianity, and be blessed with liberty. My heart would be dead to every feeling if it did not weep with the negro; and I bless every effort to let the captive go free. Judge, then, of my joy, at finding in New-York the young men uniting with their brethren in this city, in sending the black man to Africa, and praying to bless your enterprise.

I leave the question of emancipation and colonization, and all other schemes of good, to others. My object has been to state that colonization has been admirably adapted to produce good in Kentucky; 'it has been good, only good, and that continually;' and I have borne testimony to the fact with pleasure.

I conclude with the hope that the Colonization Society may extend its usefulness, and spread abroad science and religion, and satisfy all that this is a good way of blessing the colored race.



F.W. Goodwin. Pinx. T.Illman Sculp.

REV. GEORGE PECK.

THE

METHODIST MAGAZINE,

AND

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XVII, No. 3. JULY, 1835. NEW SERIES—VOL. VI, No. 3.

A DISCOURSE,

Delivered in the Methodist Episcopal Church, in White Plains, Westchester county, New-York, on Dec. 25, 1834, in commemoration of the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the organization of the M. E. Church, fifty years ago. By request of the Quarterly Meeting conference of White Plains Circuit. By Rev. P. P. SANDFORD.

'They shall call His name Emmanuel; which, being interpreted, is God with us.' Matt. i, 23.

THIS is the day on which the Christian Churches have generally agreed to celebrate the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ for the redemption and salvation of the world; and this day brings us to the fiftieth anniversary of the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church: and we are assembled here this morning to celebrate both these events. Our brethren in the city of New-York, on calling to mind the fact, that this day would be the semi-centennial anniversary of the organization of our Church, determined on its celebration among themselves, and invited their brethren in other places to unite with them therein. This led the Quarterly Meeting conference of this (White Plains) circuit, at its last session, to pass a resolution to comply with the foregoing invitation, and to request me to preach on the occasion. I have, therefore, selected the text, which I have read in your hearing, as the foundation of the present discourse, that I might, in some measure, bring both these important events before the view of this congregation.

The name *Emmanuel* is derived from three Hebrew monosyllables, viz. עם *with* נו *us*, and אל *God;* and therefore the evangelist has given it a literal translation in the text. The Messiah was prophesied of, under this appellation, by the Prophet Isaiah, more than seven hundred years before the time of our Savior's birth, (see Isa. vii, 14.) This prediction is quoted in this text, and applied by Matthew to our Lord Jesus Christ; and it is herein declared to have its fulfilment in his birth. There is also a strong resemblance to the terms of the text in the dying words of that great and good man, the Rev. J. Wesley, who, under God, was the founder of Methodism; viz. "The best of all is, God is with us." He believed and taught, as a fundamental truth of Christianity, that Jesus Christ is God with us; i. e. the incarnate Deity, who dwells in his Church, and in the hearts of his believing

people. Of the truth of this doctrine there is abundant proof, in the predictions of the Old Testament, and in the declarations of the New Testament—in the history of His birth, His life, His death, His resurrection from the dead, His ascension to heaven—in His teaching, both as it respects His doctrines and moral precepts, and in the claims which He made to an equality with God—in His miracles and prophecies—in the history of His Church during the early ages, especially on the day of pentecost, and during the apostolic age; and indeed, in every succeeding age, down to the present time. Therefore Jesus Christ is the incarnate God, who is present with His Church, and dwells in the hearts of His people. My design, at present, is to call your attention to the fact, that Jesus Christ, as the incarnate God, has been with the Methodist Episcopal Church, and that He is still with this Church, as its Divine Lord, and its heavenly Head. In doing this, however, I do not intend to intimate, that He is exclusively with this Church; but that He has ever been, and still is with it, as with a branch of His mystical and visible body upon earth. This I shall endeavor to show by the following observations:—

I. On the circumstances which led to the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

The Rev. J. Wesley, who, under God, was the founder of Methodism, was strictly educated in high Church principles, as a member and minister of the Church of England. He early in life obtained a fellowship in Lincoln College, University of Oxford, England, which placed him in easy circumstances; and had he continued in it, would have secured him a competence during life. His attachments to a college life were very strong; so much so, that he resisted the most pressing solicitations of his father, and others of his intimate friends, to accept of a curacy under his father, with a view to becoming his successor in his rectory. In the year 1729, Mr. Wesley, his brother Charles, and a few other persons, began more seriously than before to consider the nature of Christian holiness, with a view to their own spiritual improvement, and their personal conformity to its principles. They drew up for themselves very strict rules of life, and determined to conform themselves to these rules with the greatest possible exactness. They lived very abstemiously; were regular in their lives and studies; and commenced the practice of visiting the sick poor in the vicinity of Oxford, and the prisoners, with a view to communicate instruction, to pray with them, and administer medicine gratuitously, and other alms: in which course of benevolence, they literally gave away every thing they could spare from their present necessities. The regularity of their lives and studies caused them to be denominated *Methodists;* and their serious, self-denying, religious, and benevolent conduct, being a reproach to all around them, drew upon them the unofficial censures of their superiors in the university, and the ridicule of many of the students.

In 1735, Mr. Wesley, accompanied by his brother Charles, was induced to leave his beloved retirement at the university, and come over to America as a missionary to the Indians. While on his passage, and during his residence in Savannah, Georgia, he became acquainted with certain pious Moravians, by whom he was instructed into the nature of justifying faith, and experimental godliness. On his

return to England in 1738, he received farther instruction on these subjects from P. Bohler, a Moravian minister. He, and his brother Charles, were soon brought to the experience of justification by faith in Christ, and the knowledge of salvation, by the remission of their sins; and they began to publish these doctrines, first, in the Churches in the city of London, and, when these were shut against them, in the open air. They now commenced their itinerant ministry through the kingdom; many were converted through their instrumentality, and, at their own request, were taken under their pastoral care, and formed into societies. The first of these societies was formed in London, in the year 1739. In 1742, Mr. Wesley was providentially led to form his societies into smaller companies called classes. They had erected a house of worship in Bristol; by doing of which they had contracted a considerable debt. Several persons met together to devise means to liquidate this debt, when one of the company proposed that they should divide the society into classes of twelve persons each, and that one of the number should collect a penny a week from each member of his class. This was accordingly done; and the *leader*—for so he was afterward denominated—in calling on his members weekly for their subscription, was led to an acquaintance with their deportment; and it was soon discovered that some of the members did not live agreeably to their profession, and that others had trials and temptations under which they needed counsel and encouragement. When Mr. Wesley was informed of this, he said, 'This is the very thing we want.' This led him to form his societies into classes in every place. It was soon found that the weekly visitation of the members, at their houses, required more time than many of the leaders could spare; and therefore it was concluded, that they should hold weekly class meetings. The work accumulated upon the hands of the two brothers to such an extent, that they soon found it impossible to attend to it without farther aid; but this it was very difficult to procure. Most of the clergy were opposed to them; and some of them were among their most bitter persecutors. But God provided for this also. In Mr. Wesley's absence from London, Thomas Maxfield, a young man who was a member of his society, began to preach. As soon as Mr. Wesley heard of this, he hastened to London with an intention to stop him. But, before he had an opportunity of seeing Maxfield, his mother—a woman of more than ordinary learning, intelligence, and piety, who had heard him preach—said to her son, 'John, take care what you do, for that young man is as certainly called of God to preach the Gospel as you are.' This determined Mr. Wesley on hearing Maxfield himself, which he accordingly did, and therefore became convinced that he was truly called of God to preach the Gospel; and he immediately employed him to aid himself and his brother in this work. From this time lay preachers were employed as assistants in spreading Scriptural holiness throughout England and Wales; and soon after through Scotland and Ireland. In the year 1744 Mr. Wesley held his first conference with several clergymen who had united with him in this work, and some of his lay preachers. From this time conferences have been annually held among the Methodists. At these conferences they considered their doctrines, and their entire course of procedure; and, at the same time, Mr. Wesley appointed his lay preachers to their

several fields of labor. The work of God mightily prevailed through their instrumentality. Thousands, and tens of thousands, were converted to God; and many of them died in the triumphs of the Christian faith. Many of the wicked and profligate were thoroughly reformed, especially among the lower orders of the community; and many of the more respectable also were made partakers of the salvation of the Gospel. But, for several years, persecution raged, with implacable fury, against almost the entire Methodist community; and especially against the preachers, not excepting Mr. Wesley and his brother. But none of these things moved them, for they knew that God was with them.

Before Mr. Wesley's missionaries reached this continent, several families of German Irish Methodists had emigrated to this country and settled in the city of New-York; among whom was Mr. P. Embury, a local preacher. But most of these emigrants had lost the spirit of piety, and become loose in their moral habits. In the year 1766, another family of these German Irish Methodists came over, and settled among their former brethren in the city of New-York. The name of this family was Hick. Mrs. Hick, a deeply pious woman, on visiting one of these families, found several persons, who had been members of the Methodist Society in Ireland, playing at cards. With a holy indignation she threw the cards into the fire; and repairing to the house of Mr. Embury, she strongly insisted on his calling the emigrants together, and preaching to them. He accordingly preached his first sermon, in America, to five persons in his own house. After this they hired a room adjoining to the barracks, in which he preached. They also united together as a society, under the direction of Mr. Embury, in that year, which was the first Wesleyan Methodist Society on this continent. Soon after this they were visited by Lieutenant Webb, commonly known as Captain Webb, at that time a barrack-master at Albany, and a local preacher in the Methodist Society. He preached to them in his military costume, the novelty of which soon attracted attention, and caused a great increase to their congregation. Their place of worship now became too small, and they hired a rigging loft in William-street, and afterward preached to listening multitudes in the open fields.

About the same time R. Strawbridge, another Irish local preacher, settled in Maryland, and began to preach the Gospel there. Houses of worship were erected in the city of New-York, and near Pipe Creek, in Maryland; and Mr. Wesley was applied to for assistance. Two missionaries (Messrs. Boardman and Pilmore) were sent over in 1769, who were the first regular Wesleyan Methodist preachers that visited this country. Others soon followed; and, in the year 1771, Mr. Asbury, and a Mr. Wright, came over to assist in carrying on the work so happily commenced. These missionaries were men of God, whose hearts were in their work; and they preached with great success. Societies were raised up, souls were converted, and the work was extended through their labors.

As the war of the revolution soon broke out, all these missionaries, except Mr. Asbury, returned to England. But preachers were raised up in this country; and though they met with great difficulties, and some of them were severely persecuted and imprisoned, this cause

continued to increase. In addition to the other difficulties which the Methodists had to encounter at this time, they were not a Church; their preachers were all laymen, and therefore could not administer the sacraments of the Gospel to their people. Very few of the ministers of any denomination were friendly to them. The Rev. Mr. Jarrett, of Virginia, and the Rev. Mr. Ogden, of New-Jersey, were, perhaps, the only clergymen who were willing to attend their meetings, and administer the sacraments to the members of the societies. Beside, during the war, many of the clergy left the country; so that in many places, especially south of the Chesapeake, there were no ministers to be found, for many miles together, to administer the sacraments. Under these circumstances, the preachers, who were travelling in the south, determined on having ordination among themselves. They accordingly appointed a committee of their own number to ordain. These first ordained one another, and then proceeded to ordain their brethren; after which they administered the sacraments to such of their people as would consent to receive them at their hands. To this procedure of the southern preachers their northern brethren were very strongly opposed. They therefore determined to put a stop to these proceedings, or to exclude the southern preachers from their connection. Messrs. Asbury, Wm. Watters, and F. Garrettson were appointed to attend the conference in Virginia, and negotiate this matter with their southern brethren. This they accordingly did. But, for some time, there appeared to be no prospect of an amicable adjustment of the difficulty, until finally Mr. Asbury proposed that the southern preachers should suspend their administration of the sacraments for one year, and meet their northern brethren in conference, at Baltimore, the next year; and that, in the meantime, Mr. Wesley should be consulted, and his counsel and aid obtained, in regard to this matter. This proposition was acceded to on the part of the southern preachers, and peace and brotherly amity were accordingly restored. But, in the midst of all the difficulties and discouragements with which these preachers and their societies had to contend, the Lord continued to prosper their labors. In the year 1776 they had 24 travelling preachers, and 4,921 members in society; and in 1784 they had increased to 83 travelling preachers, and 14,988 members; that is, in eight years, in the midst of war, persecution, and a privation of the sacraments of the Gospel, and many other difficulties, their nett increase amounted to 59 travelling preachers, and 10,067 members of society. Beside this increase, the thousands who had died in the Lord, and entered into the joys of paradise, as the fruits of the labors of these faithful missionaries of the cross of Christ, go to prove that God was with them in an eminent manner.

II. On the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Mr. Wesley, who, as has already been observed, had been educated in high Church principles; and for many years was strongly, and perhaps, in some respects, even superstitiously attached to the rites and institutions of the Church of England, of which he continued to be a minister to the day of his death; and who, through life, avoided, as much as possible, every departure from the canons of that Church, even in matters which he judged to be lawful; from his paramount love to the cause of God and the souls of men, whenever he became

convinced that God called him to act for the promotion of His cause and the salvation of souls, never hesitated to go forward in the performance of the duty, whatever sacrifice of feeling, interest, ease, or honor, he might be called to make, or let who would oppose him.

Not that he was rash and inconsiderate. No man could be farther from rashness and inconsiderateness than he was. He sought every where for information; and was willing to hear, and carefully to weigh, every objection, which his friends or enemies might urge against his measures. But, when he was fully satisfied that he ought to act, he was perfectly inflexible. Under such circumstances, nothing could turn him from his purpose.

Lord King's account of the constitution of the early Christian Church had convinced him, many years before the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, that, in the primitive Church, bishops and presbyters were of the same order; and that therefore presbyters possessed an inherent right, by virtue of their office, to ordain men to the ministry. He therefore believed that he had a right, by virtue of his presbyterial office, when called to it in the order of Divine Providence, to ordain. But still there were such objections existing in his mind against the expediency of his exercising this right under the then existing circumstances, that, for several years, he continued to resist the strongest solicitations to exercise his prerogative, and ordain some of his lay preachers to the ministry. But, in respect to his societies in the United States of America, after duly examining the subject in all its bearings, he saw his way perfectly clear to act; inasmuch as both the civil and ecclesiastical government of Great Britain had entirely ceased in this country, and there was no one who pretended to claim any ecclesiastical authority whatever over the Methodist Societies in these United States, except that which was claimed by himself and his assistants; and his counsel and aid had been asked by these societies. In this case therefore he was ready to act.

Having matured the plan in his own mind, and consulted Dr. Thomas Coke, a presbyter of the Church of England, who had been for several years in close connection with him, and obtained the doctor's consent to his proposed plan; Mr. Wesley, aided by the doctor and the Rev. Mr. Creighton, another clergyman of the Church of England, proceeded to ordain Messrs. Richard Whatcoat and Thomas Vasey to the office of presbyters or elders—a word of the same import. These persons had offered themselves to Mr. Wesley, as missionaries to America. After this Mr. Wesley proceeded to set apart Dr. Coke to the office of a superintendent or bishop, giving him letters patent under his hand and seal, and directing him to proceed forthwith to America, to organize an independent Episcopal Church among his societies in these United States, and to set apart Mr. Francis Asbury to the episcopal office.

The doctor and his companions accordingly set sail, and landed in New-York on the 3d day of November, 1784. He found Mr. Asbury in the state of Delaware; and by an arrangement made between them the preachers were notified to meet in general conference at Baltimore, on the ensuing Christmas day, to take into consideration the proposed plan of a Church organization. On Christmas day they accordingly assembled in the city of Baltimore, when the plan devised by Mr.

Wesley was laid before them, and adopted;* and they accordingly formed themselves into an independent Church, under the title of 'The Methodist Episcopal Church.' Dr. Coke was acknowledged as one of their superintendents, agreeably to Mr. Wesley's appointment. Though Mr. Asbury had been appointed by Mr. Wesley a joint superintendent with Dr. Coke, he refused to act as such unless elected to this office by the conference. This election, however, he obtained by a unanimous vote; and he was accordingly ordained a deacon on Christmas day. On the 26th he was ordained an elder, and a superintendent on the 27th, several elders assisting Dr. Coke in his ordination; among whom was Mr. Otterbine, a pious German Presbyterian minister, who was added by the special request of Mr. Asbury.

They also ordained several of the preachers to the offices of deacons and elders; and having made several other necessary regulations, they adjourned the conference.

III. On its constitution.

They were now formed into a regular Episcopal Church, with bishops, elders, and deacons, all of whom were made elective and responsible. The supreme authority of this Church, under God, is vested in the general conference. This conference is now composed of the bishops, who are its presidents, but have no vote among its members; and of a certain proportion of delegates, chosen by each annual conference from among its elders. As the general conference is now a delegated body, its powers are so restricted that it cannot do away the Episcopacy, nor the general itinerant superintendency. Neither can it alter any of the articles of religion, the general rules of the society; nor do away the privileges of the ministers, preachers, nor private members, of a trial by their peers, and of an appeal; nor appropriate the produce of the Book Concern, nor of the Charter Fund, to any other purposes than those to which they are now devoted by the existing canons of the Church. Under these limitations, this conference, which meets quadrennially, has full powers to make rules and regulations for the Church; it also possesses judiciary powers in respect to the bishops, and appellant powers in respect to the members of the several annual conferences, which are severally composed of all the travelling ministers within their bounds.

All the bishops of this Church possess co-ordinate powers. A bishop is constituted by the election of a general conference, and the laying on of the hands of three bishops, or of one bishop and two elders; except there should be no bishop, in which case any three elders, who may be appointed for that purpose by the general conference, may perform the consecration service. It is made the duty of a bishop to travel at large through the conferences; to take the general superintendence of the spiritual and temporal concerns of the Church; to preside in the general and annual conferences; to appoint the travelling ministers and preachers to their several stations; and to ordain elected persons to the offices of elders and deacons. A bishop is responsible to the general conference for his moral, Christian, and official conduct.

* Jesse Lee, in his History of the Methodists, says, it was on the 27th day of December; which is evidently a mistake, as Mr. Asbury was ordained a deacon at that conference on the 25th. See the certificate of his ordination in his Journal, as given under the hand of Dr. Coke, vol. i, p. 378.

A travelling elder is constituted by the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop, assisted by several elders. Before any person can be thus elected and ordained, he must have exercised the office of a travelling deacon for two years; except in the case of missionaries. An elder is to do all the duties of a travelling preacher, to administer the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist, and celebrate marriage. He is amenable to an annual conference for his moral, Christian, and ministerial conduct. A presiding elder differs from others, only by his being appointed to the charge of a district. It is his duty to travel through his district, attend the quarterly meetings of the several circuits, hold quarterly meeting conferences for the transaction of the circuit business, (which conferences are to be composed of the travelling and local ministers and preachers, exhorters, class leaders, and stewards of the circuit,) and to take the oversight of all the travelling and local ministers and preachers, and the exhorters of his district, &c. Local elders are constituted by the recommendation of a quarterly meeting conference, the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop, and several elders. They are amenable to a quarterly meeting conference; and are to perform all the functions of the ministry, occasionally, except the pastoral duties.

A travelling deacon is constituted by the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop. Before a preacher can be thus ordained, he must have been received on trial in an annual conference, have travelled two years, and been received into full membership with the conference, by the vote of its members. A deacon is to perform all the duties of a travelling preacher, to assist the elder in the administration of the Lord's Supper, to administer baptism, and to celebrate marriage. He is amenable to an annual conference, in the same manner as an elder. A local preacher may be constituted a deacon, after he has held the office of a licensed preacher for four successive years, on the recommendation of a quarterly meeting conference, by the election of an annual conference, and the laying on of the hands of a bishop. Local preachers are constituted, on the recommendation of the class of which they are members, or of a leaders' meeting, by the election of a quarterly meeting conference, and the certificate of a presiding elder. Exhorters are licensed by the minister in charge of the circuit, on the recommendation of the class, as aforesaid, or of a leaders' meeting. Circuit stewards are elected by the quarterly meeting conference on the nomination of the minister in charge. Class leaders are appointed by the minister. Private members of the Church are first admitted by the minister on a probation of six months; at the expiration of which time, provided their conduct has been satisfactory to the society, and they are recommended by their leader, the minister, after due and satisfactory examination, may admit them into full membership in the Church.

But, it has been objected, by persons holding high Church principles, that the Methodist Episcopacy is invalid, because Mr. Wesley, from whom it emanated, was only a presbyter. To this it may be replied, that some of the leading men among the English reformers, especially Archbishop Cranmer, was of Mr. Wesley's opinion; viz. that bishops

and presbyters were originally of the same order. If so the Methodist Episcopacy is valid. Others, who were men of high Church principles, acknowledged that Episcopal ordination (though of Divine right, as they asserted,) is not absolutely necessary to a valid Christian ministry. And others again, who would not admit the correctness of the opinion last stated, did nevertheless acknowledge, that, in a case of necessity, Episcopal ordination might be dispensed with. Now the validity of Methodist Episcopacy may be maintained on any or all these grounds. Mr. Wesley professedly acted on the first. And on that ground there can be no question concerning his right to ordain. According to the second opinion of some of the English reformers, the validity of Methodist ordination cannot be disputed. But if neither of these could be sustained, the third opinion, which appears to have been admitted by the most rigid Episcopalians among these early reformers, will, it is presumed, fully justify the course pursued by Mr. Wesley and the American Methodists, and consequently prove the validity of Methodist Episcopacy. From the facts which have been briefly stated in the preceding part of this discourse, the necessity of the case was such, that every candid and unprejudiced mind, it is presumed, will readily acknowledge the propriety of using any lawful means, by which the existing evils might be removed. The questions to be resolved were: Shall thousands of Christians live and die without the Christian sacraments; and tens of thousands of the children of Christian parents grow up without Christian baptism? Or shall their stated teachers be authorized to administer these sacraments to them? Now, who would hesitate to acknowledge, if necessity can justify a departure from ordination by Episcopal succession in any case, that it was justifiable in the case before us? If any should be found who, after considering all the above grounds of justification of the course pursued by Mr. Wesley and the American Methodists, still deny that the Methodist Episcopacy is valid; and continue to assert, that nothing can justify a departure from ordination, by a regular Episcopal succession from the apostles; it is presumed that they will find but few, among candid and enlightened Christians, who will deliberately agree with them; and they are requested to sit down, and make out *their* regular Episcopal succession, before they bring the want of it as an objection against the validity of the ministry of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

IV. On its government.

In examining into the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, it must not be forgotten, that it is a great itinerant system; and that this itinerancy could not continue to exist, and its operations be facilitated, without great sacrifices on the part of its itinerant ministry, and a cordial consent on the part of its local ministers and its members in general, to that part of its economy which places the government into the hands of the itinerant ministers. While, therefore, the great body of the Methodist people shall continue to prefer an itinerant to a local ministry, they will prefer the present form of government to any other which might be substituted in its place; but, as soon as they grow weary of this system, and determine to have local pastors of their own immediate selection, they will take the government of the Church into their own hands, and the itinerancy will come to an end. The authority invested in the ministers of this

Church is fully sustained by the New Testament. And it is worthy of remark, that it not only has been exercised for the good of the private members of the Church; but that it is especially calculated for their spiritual improvement. It imposes nothing upon them which is rigid or severe. The travelling ministers have to sustain the greatest burdens, to make the greatest sacrifices, and possess the smallest earthly advantages of any class of its members. The bishops are placed under the severest restrictions, and are called to perform the most laborious service of any persons over whom this Church exercises a jurisdiction. Next to them, the travelling ministers and preachers have to make the greatest sacrifices, and perform the most laborious service, and that, in general, with a very scanty and uncertain support, while the local ministers and preachers, and the private members of the Church are left to pursue their honest worldly avocations at their pleasure, and not even one cent of their property can be taken from them, without their own consent, by any of the authorities of the Church. This is not designed to disparage the local ministry of the Church. Many of the local ministers and preachers make considerable sacrifices of their time and their money, in the service of the Church, while they look for no earthly reward for these sacrifices and services; and many times, while the members of the Church look with cold indifference upon their labors of love. The travelling ministers do not stipulate with the people, to serve them for a competent support. They come to them in the name of the Lord, leaving it with them to say whether they shall be supported or not; and many times they are not so much as asked one question on the subject by the committee of the quarterly conference, by whom their allowance is determined; nor even so much as informed by them what amount they are to receive for their support, till more than one half the year has expired for which the appropriation is made. When the appropriation is thus made known to these itinerants, they must be satisfied with it, however scanty; and if the people do not voluntarily pay it, they must be contented to do without it: and it frequently happens that one half the appropriation remains unpaid for ever. These statements are made, at the present, not by way of complaint, but of illustration; and to repel the unjust insinuations of many of the enemies of this Church. As the pastors of the people, it is made the duty of these itinerant ministers to watch over them in the Lord; to urge them to the performance of their Christian and relative duties; to reprove such of them as act inconsistently with their Christian profession; to preside in all ecclesiastical trials among the people of their charge; and to excommunicate such members as have been found guilty of a violation of the canons of the Church, by a committee of their lay brethren, acting as jurors in the case. But, the membership of each individual, and his Church privileges are so secured to him by the constitution of the Church, that it is not in the power of any minister, or of all the ministers combined, to deprive him of them, by virtue of any authority invested in the ministers of the Church.

V. On its doctrines.

These have been sufficiently proved to be the same as those of the Church of England, as contained in her articles, liturgy, and homilies, by Messrs. Wesley and Fletcher. And that they are the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, has not only been proved by them, but by many

other writers, and in all the Methodist pulpits in Europe and America. I shall not, therefore, detain you longer upon them at the present. They are, evidently, in the general, the doctrines of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the incarnate God, and who has owned them in the conversion and final salvation of myriads of souls.

VI. On its discipline. This also is manifestly founded on, and drawn from the word of God; and it is highly calculated to promote the spirit and practice of Christian holiness and Scriptural morality, which ought to be the end of all ecclesiastical discipline; and, in its requirements and results, gives sufficient evidence that it has the sanction of the great Head of the Church.

VII. On its institutions.

Under this head we might notice class meetings, love feasts, watch-nights, quarterly meetings, and missionary, Bible, Sunday school, and tract societies; and also its literary institutions, and the Book Concern, including its periodicals. But it is impossible to enlarge upon all these, within our present limits. Some of these are well calculated to keep alive, in the minds of Christians, the spirit of piety, and to influence them to the practice of every Christian duty: especially weekly class meetings. The Missionary Society of the M. E. Church specially deserves a passing notice, as it has done more toward the evangelization of the world, in proportion to the time it has existed, and the scanty means it has been able to employ, than any other similar institution of the present age. But we should never lose sight of the fact, that the Methodist Episcopal Church is a great missionary institution; and that every one of its travelling ministers and preachers is a missionary. The Sunday school society, too, has done much toward the education of the rising generation, in religion and morals: and a laudable zeal has been manifested among the ministers and members of this Church, in many places, upon this subject. Mr. Wesley was one of the first to promote the Sunday school cause in England; and Mr. Asbury in this country. Mr. Wesley may also be ranked among the fathers of the tract cause, as he wrote and published many religious tracts, which he circulated gratuitously, for many years before a tract society was in existence. The cause of literature also lay near his heart; and the two literary institutions under the Wesleyan Methodists in England, though they had not collegiate powers, are said to stand very high in public estimation, for affording young men an opportunity to obtain a solid, classical education. The first bishops, too, of the M. E. Church, showed a laudable zeal in the cause of literature, by using all their influence to establish a college, under the protection of the Church over which they presided. Cokesbury College was the fruit of this zeal. But it would appear that the time had not then come in which the providence of God would favor this design among the Methodists; and, therefore, after it had been in operation about ten years, it was burned to the ground, and never rebuilt. Other attempts of a similar nature were subsequently made without success. Recently, however, the literary institutions of the M. E. Church, both academies and colleges, have risen up in different parts of the country, and, considering their slender endowments, promise much. One thing is especially worthy of remark concerning them, viz. that revivals of religion have been more or less identified with them; and the students, instead of

being corrupted by becoming the inmates of these institutions, are more likely to become religious by being placed in them, than by being kept under their paternal roofs.

VIII. On its growing prosperity.

Ever since the organization of the Church, the Methodists in this country have been multiplying much faster than they ever did before. Revivals of religion commenced, almost every where within the limits of the Church, soon after its organization: so that the Church grew with the growth of the country; extended with its new settlements; and increased continually with its increasing population. The result of which is, that it now numbers 638,784 Church members, and 2,625 travelling ministers and preachers. As we have already noticed, at the time of the organization of the Church, they numbered 14,988 members, and 83 travelling preachers; so that in fifty years the nett increase of Church members is more than forty-six times greater; and that of the travelling ministers and preachers, more than thirty-one and a half times greater than they were at the time when the Church was organized. What hath God wrought! Surely, Jesus Christ, the incarnate God, the great Head of the Church, has been with this branch of His mystical body on earth, in an eminent manner, during the fifty years of its existence.

IX. On the great moral and spiritual effects which have resulted from its operations.

In speaking of the great moral and spiritual advantages which have resulted from the existence of the M. E. Church, in this country, we are not to confine ourselves to those who are now its members. We should look, first, at the hundreds of thousands of souls which have been saved from guilt and depravity through its instrumentality; and who, after exerting a beneficial influence upon their country, and indeed upon all classes of their fellow men, have finally died in the fellowship of this Church, in the faith of the Gospel, and in the peace of God; and are now safely lodged in Abraham's bosom. But, secondly, the influence of the M. E. Church has not been confined to those who have become its members. Tens of thousands, yea, hundreds of thousands, it is presumed, who have been converted to God through the instrumentality of the Methodists, have joined other Churches, and become ornaments to their communions. Thirdly, we are not to stop even here. Methodism has exerted a beneficial influence upon most of the other Churches throughout this widely-extended country. Their doctrines have become more pure, their preaching more evangelical, their lives more holy through this influence; and multitudes, in all probability, have been saved through the instrumentality of these other Churches, who never would have been, but for the influence which the M. E. Church has exerted upon them. Fourthly, we are not to stop even here. Methodism has exerted an influence upon the American community, which has done more than can be estimated to promote the growing prosperity, the peace, and especially the good morals of the country at large. And, fifthly, it has exerted a great amount of moral and spiritual influence upon the aborigines of this country; and extended it, through American commerce, to almost every part of the world. Surely, therefore, we may say in truth, that Jesus Christ is God *with us*. He has, evidently, presided over the destinies

of the M. E. Church for fifty years. He prepared the way, in his providence, and by his grace, for its organization. He caused that organization to be effected. He has been with its ministers and members, and sustained them in their arduous labors and their various trials. He has been with their assemblies. He has dwelt by his Spirit in the hearts of all its faithful members. And, therefore, we may say with the dying Wesley, 'The best of all is, God is with us.' Now, as God has thus been with this Church for fifty years; and as He is evidently with it still, as its present growing prosperity evinces, we have reason to believe that He will continue to be with it.—He certainly will be, if its ministers and members continue to be with Him. And then, what may we not calculate upon in respect to the future? If the M. E. Church should continue to flourish and increase for fifty years to come, as she has done for the fifty years that are past, how vast would be the extent of her influence in the world, how numerous her ministers and members would become, and how gloriously her converts would triumph in heaven! If the number of her ministers and members should increase for fifty years to come, as they have done for the fifty years that are past, they would then amount to 82,687 travelling ministers and preachers, and 29,384,264 Church members. I do not pretend to say that this will be the case; but I do not hesitate to say that this is possible. There is room enough in these United States for a vast increase of its population, and the country is certainly increasing very rapidly. It is not at all impossible, that, in fifty years to come, the population of this country may amount to sixty millions. And why might not the membership of the M. E. Church amount to half that number? But I will not at present indulge in any farther speculation upon this subject; but draw this subject to a close, by briefly inquiring what we ought to do under these circumstances. What then ought the ministers and members of this Church to do, in endeavoring to make some return of gratitude to their Divine Benefactor, for the benefits which He has conferred upon them? Surely, we ought not to sit down in supineness, as though the conquest was already gained. But every minister and member of the Church should be stimulated by a view of what God has already done for us, and the prospect which He is opening up before us, to increased exertion in endeavoring to extend this cause. We have men and money: and the whole world lies open before us. Look after our missionaries among the aborigines. Look even beyond the Rocky Mountains, where the intrepid Lees are in search of the wild men of the forests, and laboring and suffering to bring them to the knowledge of God our Savior. Follow the missionary of the cross to Africa, and see that benighted continent opening before him. Look toward Mexico and South America, and see what is to be done there. Then turn your eyes homeward, and behold the multitudes of our own citizens who are living without God in the world. And when you have taken this extensive survey, ask yourselves, What can I do toward extending this cause in the world? Believe that you can do something in this business; and resolve by the grace of God to do it. Depend upon it, God requires this at your hands; and the united prayers, money, and labors, of the members and ministers of the Methodist Episcopal Church may, in the course of another half century,

extend the triumphs of the cross of Christ through all these lands, and add more than 30,000,000 of souls to the society of the redeemed in the earth.

A DISCOURSE ON WATER BAPTISM,

Preached at East Greenwich, R. I., by the Rev. JAMES PORTER.

'Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost,' Acts ii, 38.

THAT the Scriptures enjoin baptism, as the privilege and duty of believers, is universally allowed. But as to the matter of this baptism, there is some difference of opinion; some holding it to be that of the Holy Ghost, and others water. The sentiment of the Quakers is, that all the baptism required by the Gospel is spiritual; and hence they denounce water baptism, and consider those who practise it as somewhat in bondage to the law. Most other Christian denominations admit water baptism, and practise accordingly; though many of them no less believe in the baptism of the Spirit, than the Quakers themselves.

Though this difference of opinion may not immediately involve our eternal interests, if it be maintained with candid and prayerful examination; it nevertheless demands attention, inasmuch as it either encumbers the Gospel and its adherents with a groundless and unmeaning ceremony, or detracts from its worship a most important and significant rite. It ought to be the ambition of all Christians to have the worship of God as simple, and expressive, yet as ceremonial as the Scriptures require. If baptism be a human institution merely, it is desirable to know it, since its observance is attended with much labor to the ministry, and not unfrequently with great inconvenience to the laity. On the other hand, if it be an ordinance of the Gospel, the declarative honor of God, the spirituality and unanimity of His Church require its universal belief.

In this discourse I shall endeavor to maintain, that water baptism is a Gospel ordinance, binding on all Christians. And here, let it be understood, 1. It is no part of my object to prove or disprove the baptism of the Spirit. That God baptized His apostles, and some others, in the apostolic age; or that He communicates His Spirit in a degree to every man at the present, and especially to believers, I readily admit. But that this supersedes water baptism, and proves that it can have no place in the Gospel system, I deny. The progeny of Abraham were all included in God's covenant with him; but this did not supersede the necessity of an outward sign of their relation to God, which was well understood. Neither does the baptism of the Spirit contravene, in the least, that of water, which is its sign. Types cease when their antitypes appear; but signs and substances may exist together. Nor, 2, is it my object to prove that water baptism cleanses the heart from sin. Though this is asserted by papists, it forms no part of the faith of Protestants; neither has it any foundation in reason or Scripture. Aside from the faith of the subject, however holy the administrator, it can no more renew the heart, than the washing of hands, or any other equally insignificant act. Nor yet, 3, shall I

attempt very fully to show what good baptism does. This is not, and ought not to be a question, even with those who believe baptism to be a Divine institution, much less with those who deny it. But if it were necessary to know all its advantages in order to receive it, there will be time enough for this after the first question is settled; viz. Is baptism a Gospel ordinance?

In maintaining the affirmative of this question, I shall,

I. *Examine some of the more prominent objections of Friends to water baptism.*

II. *Adduce such arguments in proof of it, as I may be able.*

1. The first objection I shall notice is founded on Eph. iv, 5: 'One Lord, one faith, one baptism.' To consider all that has been written on this text to disprove water baptism, would be equally tedious and disgusting. The most of these writings assume, first, that the apostle said there is *but one* baptism; and then, with much circumlocution, proceed to prove that water baptism is not that one baptism. Their chief difficulty arises, evidently, from mistaking the whole scope of the apostle's argument. For they go on the supposition, that he was treating upon baptism numerically; whereas he undoubtedly referred to the homogeneousness of its nature and obligations, and nothing else. To understand the primitive meaning of this text, it is indispensable to consult the context. The evident design of the apostle was to prevent altercation among the members of the Ephesian Church. Some of them were probably converted Jews, and some Gentiles. Having been differently educated, and in no one thing, perhaps, more than to despise each other, they were in great danger of yielding to their national prejudices, losing the unity of the spirit, and becoming contentious. To forestall this, the apostle addresses them as follows: 'I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called, with all lowliness and meekness, with long suffering, forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace.' He then adds, as reasons why they should do this, 'There is one body,' by which he evidently means the Church. 'One Spirit'—the Holy Ghost, who animates this body. 'One hope'—of everlasting glory. 'One Lord'—Jesus Christ, who governs the Church. 'One faith'—one system of doctrines. 'One baptism'—with water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. That he refers here to water baptism is obvious, from his having just before named the Spirit, which he could not have done in this place, without unpardonable tautology. His argument is, since the Church of Christ is one, though composed of both Jews and Gentiles, having one Spirit, one hope, one Governor, one system of faith, one baptism, the nature and obligations of which are the same to all nations; and since ye all belong to this Church, and have received the same baptism, and taken upon you all its responsibilities; ye ought, therefore, to be meek, long suffering; forbearing one another in love; endeavoring to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace; and suffer no discord among you. If this then be the true meaning of the passage—and I submit it to the candid to decide—it is so far from disproving water baptism, it is important evidence in its favor.

2. The declaration of the Apostle Peter, in his first epistle, iii, 21:

'The like figure, whereunto baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ,' is quoted by Friends as demonstrative of their views. 'So plain a definition of baptism,' says Barclay, 'is not to be found in all the Bible.' But allowing him and his coadjutors all they claim from this passage, we shall only admit, that it exclusively regards spiritual baptism, and hence neither proves nor disproves that of water. Therefore, if their views of it are correct, it does not necessarily follow that ours, in the main, are wrong.

But, if spiritual baptism be here understood, how can it be said, it is the answer, or, as the Syriac has it, the confession or expression of a good conscience? The office of the Spirit is not to answer a good conscience, but to create one, by renovating the heart, and conforming it to the Divine law. Again: this exposition supposes resemblance between the ark, or waters of the flood, and the baptism of the Spirit, which is not easy to perceive. How is this a like figure of either? On their hypothesis, these difficulties are insuperable; but, when we understand the passage to speak of water baptism, they vanish. This may be considered as the antitype of the waters of the deluge with much propriety; and though it does not save us by putting away the filth of the flesh, yet it is the answer, or confession to the world, of a good conscience. I have already intimated, that circumcision was an expression of covenant relation to God. Baptism, under the Gospel, supplying its place, confesses, with equal distinctness, a good conscience in its subject, and his relation to God. 'No,' says Barclay; 'because many are baptized with water, who are not saved.' And are not many, too, baptized with the Spirit, who are not saved? Suppose some are baptized who have not a good conscience, but are hypocrites, can this affect the design of the ordinance? Do the hypocrisies of men invalidate the institutions of God? Peter is not speaking of baptism as abused; but in its design and instrumental results, when properly observed. Says Dr. Clarke, 'Noah and his family were saved by water, i. e. it was the instrument of their being saved, through the good providence of God. So the water of baptism, typifying the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit, is the means of salvation to all those who receive the Holy Spirit in its awakening, cleansing efficacy.'

3. Another objection is founded on 1 Cor. i, 17: 'Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel.' Taking this passage in its utmost latitude of meaning, the conduct of the apostle is unaccountable. If baptizing was not embraced in his commission, and was no part of his business, by what authority did he baptize Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, as confessed in the preceding verses? To say he did it without authority, could not be much to his credit, should we even allow him to be a Friend; for in this case he must have hypocritically claimed authority, or they would not have submitted to be baptized. They knew that the prerogative of baptizing was confided to the apostles; and that to baptize, without authority, would subvert the established order of the Church. These considerations are sufficient to demonstrate, that the apostle used the words, 'not to baptize,' in a restricted sense. Bishop Pearce translates this, with the approbation of learned commentators: 'Christ sent me not so

much to baptize as to preach the Gospel;' and supports his version, as follows:—'The writers of the Old and New Testaments do almost every where, agreeably to the Hebrew idiom, express a preference given to one thing beyond another, by an affirmation of that which is preferred, and a negation of that which is contrary to it.' Somewhat similar to this in strength of expression is the language of the evangelist, when he says, 'Jerusalem and all Judea' came to John's baptism; and also, 'Except ye hate father and mother,' &c. None, I presume, will pretend that every inhabitant of Jerusalem and Judea went to John's baptism, or that Christ really requires us to hate our parents! These, with the one under consideration, are broad expressions, the meaning of which is to be learned by other scriptures. At the time this epistle was penned, the Church at Corinth was much disturbed with bitter contentions. One said, 'I am of Paul,' and another, 'I am of Apollos,' &c. In view of these things, the apostle says to them, 'I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus,' &c, 'lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.' Thus it appears, his gratitude that he had baptized no more, arose from the consideration of their difficulties, and the opportunity it would have given them to accuse him of impure motives, had the number been greater. He does not even intimate but that baptism is a Gospel rite, and they had done well in being baptized; but, on the contrary, he virtually confesses both in his apology for what he did.

St. Paul was a man of consistency of character; he was not wont to do business without authority. Even when he went to Damascus to pour out the vengeance of his intolerant spirit upon the heads of the innocent disciples, he carried 'letters of authority.' And is it reasonable to conclude, that, after he was called to the apostleship, he went round baptizing; and then, by letter or otherwise, confessing that he was not authorized to baptize! The fact, that he baptized some, gives the translation of Bishop Pearce a commanding influence.

4. 'It is ceremonial.' If by this be meant, a rite of the ceremonial law, I deny it. It is true that law embraced divers washings of men and things; but not that washing which is denominated *Christian baptism.* The distinguishing characteristic of this is the name in which it is performed—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Therefore before this can justly be ranked with the washings of the ceremonial law, it must be shown that one of those washings, at least, was performed in this name, which cannot be done. But, if the objector only means, it is an outward form, the objection stands with equal force against every other external of religious worship. For if this be ceremonial, so is preaching, praying, singing, kneeling, sitting in silence, and shaking hands! But are all these to be abandoned merely for this reason? Religion without ceremony, is like a soul without a body; and to man must be perfectly visionary and untangible. But God has wisely connected them; and what He has joined together, let not man put asunder.

5. 'Some have been saved without being baptized.' The inference pretended to be deduced from this is, that water baptism is not essential to salvation, and consequently is not required by the Gospel. But is this a fair inference from the premises? How far God may regard the ignorance, prejudices, and superstitions of men, in the day of

judgment, is somewhat difficult to decide. Though baptism is a Gospel ordinance, binding on all Christians, it is not incredible, that such may be the circumstances under which some neglect it, that their neglect will not prove an insuperable barrier to their salvation. Hence, if the premises in the objection be true, the inference deduced from it is not legitimate.

Some have undoubtedly been saved without the Gospel, and without practising many of the duties it enjoins. But does it follow that the Gospel is not from God, and that its observance is not necessary to salvation with those who have it? The objection insinuates, that it does. Thus, it is obvious, should the objection be followed out in all its ramifications, it would lead to most fatal results.

6. 'Christ did not baptize.' That He did not, on one occasion, referred to, John iv, 2, is admitted; but that He never baptized, is not so clear. Whether He did or not, however, it is evident His disciples baptized with His direction and approvance; otherwise He would have rebuked them, and pointed out the repugnancy of water baptism to the spirituality of the Gospel dispensation, as He was accustomed to do, when He discovered any aberration in their principles or conduct from the laws of His kingdom. That He ever expressed any dissatisfaction with them on account of their baptizing, does not appear from the Bible; but, on the contrary, when He was about going to His Father, He commanded His apostles to 'go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature, baptizing them' *with water*, as I shall show in the sequel of this discourse. Therefore, had He baptized with His own hand, He would not more fully have given His sanction to the ordinance than He did; 'though He baptized not, but His disciples.'

7. The last objection I shall notice is found in the inquiry, 'If baptism be a Divine ordinance, why is not *pediluvium*, or feet-washing, enjoined by Christ; and circumcision, practised by Paul in the case of Timothy?' In regard to the first, I answer, It was enjoined on the disciples as an act of civility and humility merely, and not designed to be perpetual or universal. In proof of this, I observe, that washing feet is not mentioned, as a religious rite, directly or indirectly, by either Christ or His apostles; whereas the injunction *be baptized*, and the declaration *he was*, or *they were* baptized, and similar references to this subject, are recorded in almost every part of the New Testament. This, with every unprejudiced man, capable of weighing an argument, is a satisfactory reason for not practising *pediluvium*. Were other reasons necessary, they could be easily adduced; but surely they are not.

That St. Paul circumcised Timothy, the Scriptures plainly avow. This he did for reasons which he thought sufficient to justify it, and which (unhappily for Friends) are not concealed. Acts xvi, 3, it is said, 'Him,' referring to Timothy, 'would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him, *because of the Jews which were in those quarters; for they knew all that his father was a Greek.*' 'Because of the Jews.' Here we have the reason in full why the apostle did this; in which it is virtually conceded that circumcision is not a Gospel rite. Says Dr. Clarke, 'He (Timothy) was circumcised for this simple reason, that the Jews would neither have heard him preach, nor would they have had any connection with him, had he

been otherwise. Beside, St. Paul himself could have had no access to the Jews, in any place, had they known that he associated with a person who was uncircumcised: they would have considered both to be unclean. The circumcision of Timothy was a merely prudential thing. Timothy was laid under no necessity to observe the Mosaic ritual; nor would it prejudice his spiritual state, because he did not do it in order to seek justification by the law, for this he had before, through faith in Christ. In Gal. ii, 3–5, we read that Paul refused to circumcise Titus, who was a Greek, and his parents Gentiles, notwithstanding the entreaties of some zealous Judaizing Christians; as their object was to bring him under the yoke of the law. Here the case was widely different, and the necessity of the measure indisputable.' Had the apostle refused to baptize any for the reasons he assigns in Galatians for not practising circumcision, the case would be different. But there is not one word in all his epistles against baptism, and very many in its support. Beside, circumcision is not once enjoined in the New Testament; it was not practised by the apostles except in this case, nor has it been by their successors down to the present time; whereas baptism is repeatedly enjoined, and was practised by the apostles, as I shall hereafter show.

There are some few other objections which might be noticed; but they are frivolous, compared with the foregoing. If I have answered these, the rest must yield of course.

I now proceed,

II. *To adduce such arguments in proof of water baptism as are to be found in the Gospel.*

On this part of the subject, I must necessarily be brief. This, however, is no apology for the discourse. The greatest brevity which could be desired is sufficient, I think, to secure the objects in view.

1. My first argument is drawn from the commission our Lord gave to His apostles: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' No one who is not biased by the love of theory could suppose that baptism here is any other than that of water. And yet, Friends are very confident, that it is the baptism of the Spirit. That it is water baptism, and not the baptism of the Spirit, is to me very obvious, from the following considerations:—

(1.) At the time when this commission was announced, the Holy Ghost had not been given; see Luke xxiv, 49. Hence the apostles were comparatively ignorant of spiritual baptism, if indeed they had any idea of it. With water baptism they were perfectly familiar. If therefore Christ had meant spiritual baptism, would He not have made an explanation expressive of his meaning? Reason says, He would, if He designed to be understood. As no such explanation was given, it is therefore clear, that He referred to the baptism with which they were acquainted, viz. water baptism.

(2.) It is the prerogative of Christ alone to baptize with the Holy Spirit. John said, 'I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance; but He that cometh after me is mightier than I; He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.' But this commission makes it the duty of the *apostles* to baptize. The apostles baptized with water; Christ alone baptized with the Holy Ghost.

If it be said, They were to baptize instrumentally, I answer, Then they were to preach and teach all nations instrumentally! But this is an anomaly in divinity which no reasonable man will readily allow. They were sent to preach the Gospel, not instrumentally, but literally and directly; and, with equal certainty, to baptize literally and directly. The baptism in the text is literal, and not spiritual.

(3.) They were to baptize 'in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' What, baptize with the Holy Ghost, in the name of the Holy Ghost! Strange orthodoxy! Wonderful discrimination! Here we see to what absurdities men are led in defence of their creed! Did Peter and John lay their hands on the disciples, at Samaria, in the name of the Holy Ghost, when the Holy Ghost came upon them? Did Paul use these words when he laid his hands on the twelve disciples at Ephesus? If not, did they not violate their Master's command? The truth is, this is a ceremony attending the communication of the Holy Ghost which the apostles never heard of, and of course never practised. And to suppose it embraced in the commission of Christ to His apostles, is to outrage every principle of interpretation; and establish a precedent which may be wielded in support of the wildest reveries of the most frantic imagination. Beside this, the universal practice of the apostles looks it out of countenance into contempt; and proves, so far as principle may be proved by the practice of inspired men, that the apostles understood their commission to embrace water baptism. Thus this commission stands an eternal monument of the obligation of baptism; and is not to be obscured by the sophistry of men.

2. Those scriptures which speak of water baptism in contradistinction from spiritual, incontestably prove it to be an ordinance of the Gospel. The text contains a command to 'repent and be baptized,' with a promise, 'and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' Here water baptism, as well as repentance, is made a prerequisite to that of the Spirit. *Water baptism*, I say; for I know not what other can be meant, without perverting the meaning and sense of language. To suppose it is spiritual, is to make the apostle say, Repent, and receive the Holy Ghost, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost! Friends must now admit water baptism, or adopt this unmeaning tautology.

In Acts viii, 13, we learn that Simon Magus believed, and was baptized. In the same chapter, it is said, 'When he saw that, through laying on of the apostles' hands, the Holy Ghost was given, he offered them money, saying, Give me also this power;' and that Peter said unto him, 'Thy money perish with thee! thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter, for thy heart is not right in the sight of God.' Here, then, is one who had been baptized, and yet had no part nor lot in the Holy Ghost. Will Friends say, he was baptized with the Holy Ghost?

3. The apostles practised water baptism. This, perhaps, is sufficiently clear from what has already been said; but that no doubt may remain, I present the following remarks:—Philip preached and *baptized* in Samaria; Acts viii, 12. When the apostles heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John, who laid their hands on certain of them, 'and they received the Holy

Ghost.' Hence it appears, that Philip did not baptize them with the Holy Ghost; for He had fallen on none of them when Peter and John arrived. The case of Cornelius and his household is no less conclusive. Peter said, 'Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' Thus, it appears they had already received the Holy Ghost, and nevertheless Peter demands water to baptize them. O! what a shadowy, ceremonial minister he must have been, to deal so much in signs and ceremonies in the midst of Divine substances! The twelve disciples whom Paul found at Ephesus were baptized, probably, by his own hand, or, at least, by his direction. And the subsequent mention of his laying his hands on them, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, is demonstration that their first baptism was not that of the Holy Ghost.

To these and many more passages of a similar character, I might add the testimony of the fathers. I shall, however, only allude to them. Irenæus and Justin Martyr, born near the close of the first century; Clemens Alexandrinus and Tertullian, born a little after; and Origen, born A. D. 184, all testify, directly or indirectly, that water baptism was practised in their time; and that they received it from the apostles. Were this not true, it would have been contradicted at the time they wrote, and some traces of the contradiction must have reached us; but this is not the case. Therefore their testimony must go to corroborate the proposition under consideration.

Having, as I trust, demonstrated water baptism to be a Gospel ordinance, little, very little, is necessary to prove that it is binding on all Christians; for, I consider, they stand or fall together. If water baptism were never a Divine ordinance, it is not binding on any; but if it were, it is now binding, unless it can be shown when and by whom it was abrogated. The Gospel is not like Church creeds, and almost every thing else subject to human volition, changeable, and ever changing. What it was in the beginning, it is now, and ever will be. The perpetuity of its character and claims stands based on the unchanging word of Jehovah. And do we think of binding the Divine will to the vain conceits of men, and thus detracting from the oracles of God? The Gospel is the sure word of testimony. While that stands, the obligation of baptism must remain. In conclusion. It is urged upon all who love our Lord Jesus Christ to be baptized. 1. Because the Scriptures require it. The same authority, which enjoins repentance and faith, enjoins baptism. Can we believe the authority of the former, and reject that of the latter? Is not this as peremptory as the command to *repent, and believe?* Why then neglect it? Did not God mean as he said? The stale objection, 'It was done away in Christ,' is too palpably false to be repeated. Just as much were repentance and prayer done away in Christ. He did not die to abolish the institutions of the Gospel, but to render them valid and good. Do you say, 'I don't feel it my duty to be baptized?' Are your feelings then the rule of faith and practice? Are these the law by which you are to be judged? If not, beware how you study it. Your not feeling it your duty is no excuse for neglect in this case. The Gospel is plain. 'Repent and be *baptized every one of you.*' And by this law shall we be acquitted or condemned in the day of judgment.

Do you say again, 'It can do no good?' You are too late. God is beforehand with you; and by the injunction, 'Be baptized,' he implicitly declares its advantages. 'It can do no good!' O, what a slander on the Almighty. Has God required what is useless? O, say it not, lest thou be convicted of folly and pride.

2. It is a mean of grace, in the observance of which many have been blessed. In receiving baptism, we publicly renounce the world, the flesh, and the devil; and pledge ourselves to keep God's holy commandments all the days of our lives. To say nothing, therefore, of the grace received on the occasion, the results of so holy a profession and solemn pledge, on our subsequent conduct, cannot be unimportant. Such is the significancy and impressiveness of this rite, that its obligations are not easily obliterated from the mind. They spring up, as it were, spontaneously, in the mind, to suppress our rising depravity, and stimulate to the performance of every duty. Well therefore is it said, 'Baptism doth save us.' So salutary is its influence, it seems very desirable, if not indispensable.

The utility of baptism, however, is not fully developed in its natural influence on the conduct of man. As the Spirit descended like a dove upon Christ when He came up from the water, so it invariably accompanies the proper administration and reception of baptism. The eunuch, when he was baptized, went on his way rejoicing. The three thousand, baptized on the day of pentecost, for the remission of sins, 'continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.' The rejoicings of the baptized, also, form an important item in this evidence. On this I might enlarge; but I leave you to make your own reflections.

Thus it is obvious that baptism is a glorious mean of grace, and not to be slighted with impunity. If we slight it, we do it at our peril.

3. I urge baptism, lastly, by the consideration that it can do no harm. This, I allow, is not a sufficient reason for action in every case; but in this it is: for the least Friends themselves can admit is, that baptism is very possibly a Divine ordinance. But if it be, it is of importance, and cannot be neglected without spiritual loss. In being baptized then, we risk nothing; whereas, in neglecting it, we risk every thing. Since, therefore, the devout observance of it can do us no injury, we are sacredly bound to be baptized. If we must err, it is better to err on the safe side. Rather perform five ceremonies not required, than neglect one the Gospel enjoins. The penalty of disobedience is severe; but supererogation is not threatened. Then abandon your prejudices, '*and be baptized every one of you, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.*'

The God of all grace, who has called us unto His eternal glory, by Christ Jesus, make you perfect, establish, strengthen, settle you. To Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.

A SHORT ESSAY

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE ACTIONS AND SUFFERINGS OF JESUS CHRIST.

Introduction.

SOMETHING more than forty years ago, being in company with the Rev. Christopher Spry and the Rev. Evan Rogers, two Methodist preachers of high standing at that time, one of them asked the other, 'Whether Jesus Christ suffered as man only, or as God and man?' After some conversation upon the subject, it was dropped, without any decision upon the question. I took no part in the conversation, but listened, as became my youth, to the observations of older men. Indeed, I had no opinion to offer, as that was the first time I had heard the subject agitated. Soon after this, being in company with a young man who had been educated for the ministry, but who had unfortunately become a disciple of Thomas Paine, he put the same question to me—that is, 'Whether Jesus Christ suffered as man only, or as God and man?' and seeing that I hesitated, he remarked, that 'He could not suffer in His Divine nature; and if He suffered only in His human nature, the sufferings of Peter or Paul would have gone as far toward making an atonement for sin as His.' The subject now assumed an importance in my view, as it disclosed the ground on which he, and probably many others, had rejected Divine revelation. On turning my attention to the Scriptures for a solution of the difficulty, I became satisfied, that, as Jesus Christ united both the Divine and human natures in His person, He must have suffered in both; and that this was the testimony of the Scriptures on the point. But it is one thing to say Christ suffered and died as our Redeemer, and another to say the Godhead suffered and died. The latter sentiment would be improper, as it excludes the other part of his complex person, and conveys the idea that God died. But that may be predicated of a complex person which cannot be of a simple person. And it should be borne in mind, that when the Divine and human natures became united, that union formed a distinct person, with new attributes and capabilities, even our *Savior;* of whom we may affirm, that he suffered and died: that is, that the two natures of our Savior suffered together, till a separation took place between that which was spiritual and that which was corporeal in His person, which is what we understand by His death. But no separation ever took place between the Divine nature and the human soul of Christ.

This Essay assumes that the union of the Divine and human nature, in the person of Christ, was such, that neither could be excluded in any action, suffering, or state of His; and that to exclude one is to dissolve the union. And on this ground it is that the Scriptures frequently refer suffering to the complex person of our Savior, as when they say, 'Christ suffered for us, Christ died,' &c, without once intimating that it is to be limited to a part, or to the human nature. Nay more: they refer suffering and death to the Divine nature directly, as the most important part of, and as implying His complex person. The Scriptures indifferently refer suffering and

death to the human or Divine nature; and that for this obvious reason, that whatever part of a complex person, known and acknowledged to be such, be mentioned, the whole person is understood.

It has appeared quite strange to me, that at a time when so much is said from the pulpit and the press upon the doctrines of the trinity, the Divinity and incarnation of Christ, the doctrines of the atonement, &c, that scarcely any thing should have been said or written upon the character of those labors and sufferings by which the redemption of the world has been accomplished. And this is the more strange, as the Unitarians have accused the friends of the atonement as vacillating upon this point. They say, 'The orthodox think the doctrine of the atonement as they hold it, gives them greatly the advantage, as it rests on a sacrifice of infinite value; but when we object, that this involves the worse than absurd idea, that God himself died, they change their ground, and tell us that 'Jesus Christ suffered only in his human nature.' And this every trinitarian must know to be the fact. Hence something more consistent and satisfactory is certainly desirable. The following Essay it is hoped will supply the desideratum. The subject, in itself, and in its influence on practical and experimental piety, is important; and the writer only regrets that it had not fallen to the lot of some one of more ability and leisure to set it in a proper light. Such as the attempt is, he commends it to God and his brethren, and hopes for a successful issue.

It is frequently said of our blessed Savior, that 'He did this as man, and that as God;' 'that he suffered in his human nature alone, and that he could not suffer in his Divine nature.' But this is a mode of speaking which it is believed the Scriptures will not warrant, and which is calculated to mislead the inquirer in some important respects, and betrays those who use it into inconsistency and self contradiction. Whatever is said or done by our Savior respects His whole person, and not merely a part of it.

All orthodox Christians represent sin as an evil of such magnitude that it cannot be expiated but by an infinite sacrifice; but when the difficulty of conceiving how the Divine nature could suffer is presented to view, they seem to retract, and give us this sentiment, that 'Jesus Christ suffered only in His human nature.' But if the doctrine of vicarious satisfaction rests alone on the suffering of the mere human nature of Christ, it follows, that the merit of His suffering was finite, and could never atone for sin.

Nor will it obviate the difficulty to say that 'the human nature was ennobled and dignified by its union with the Divine, and therefore His sufferings possessed an infinite value.' It is one thing to assert this, and another to prove it. However ennobled and dignified the human nature was by its union with the Divine, it was human nature still, and could *merit* nothing.

It will avail as little to say that 'the human nature was offered upon the altar of, or was supported by the Divine nature, and therefore possessed an infinite value.' To this it may be replied,—

First, That the Divine nature, in distinction from the human, is nowhere in Scripture represented as an altar for this purpose; and

Secondly, That if the office of the Divine nature, in making the atonement, was to support the human nature in its sufferings, it could have done this as well without becoming incarnate, as to support the saints in their sufferings without becoming incarnate for each individual. But

Thirdly, It nowhere appears that the human nature of Christ had this support, but the contrary. He was dismayed and overwhelmed by the magnitude of His sufferings; and His soul was in agony: He sunk, and died. We are told that the 'angels ministered to Him' in His extremity; but if He had been supported by the infinite, unsuffering Divinity, there would have been no room for the ministry of angels in the case.

It would not, however, be proper to say, without qualification, that the Deity suffered, or that the Divinity died. This would be as improper as to limit the sufferings of Christ to his humanity. We cannot say that the Deity, *as* Deity, can suffer; but we can say that that which is impossible to the Deity, *as* Deity, is possible to Him as incarnated. It was impossible that the Deity, *as* Deity, should be born of a woman; but it was not impossible for him as incarnated. The fact that He was so born proves that it was not impossible.

The proposition laid down and defended in the following pages is this: *That all the actions and sufferings of Jesus Christ were the actions and sufferings of the God-man*, or, in other words, *the complex person of our blessed Savior.*

To prepare the way for what may be said in support of this proposition, it may be well to premise a few things.

Those who limit the sufferings of Jesus Christ to his human nature, speak on the subject, as though each part of a complex person has a property in every other part, and in the actions and sufferings of the whole person, though they do not act or suffer together. Hence they say the sufferings of the human nature of Christ were the sufferings of the Divine nature, though the latter did not suffer. But a little attention to the subject will show this to be an error.

Every person and thing has something which makes it what it is, and which distinguishes it from every thing else. This is called *identity*. The two natures of Jesus Christ were united in His incarnation, and formed *one person*, having identity, which is essential to Him as the one Mediator between God and men. If, therefore, we destroy the identity of His person as Mediator, or disunite the two natures, it follows of course, that there is no Mediator, though the two natures exist separately.

But how can the personal identity of the Mediator be destroyed? We answer, In one way only, by separating the two natures, the human and the Divine; and this it is conceived is done when we limit any action or suffering to one nature, and exclude the other. While the identity of our Savior's person remains, every action and suffering must be the action and suffering of His whole person, unless we choose to say that the *same* person may both act and *not* act—suffer and *not* suffer at the same time, which would be a contradiction in terms, and cannot be true.

Thus we see that the property which any part of a complex person has in every other part, and in the actions and sufferings of the whole, depends entirely on the *identity* of person. But, if we separate the

parts of which the person is composed, there remains no common interest in the attributes of either. If we limit the sufferings of our Savior to His human nature, and exclude the Divine nature from sharing in them, we separate the two natures; and the sufferings of the former are no more the sufferings of the latter, than were the sufferings of Peter or Paul. It is conceived that only on the ground maintained in this Essay, this personal identity of our Savior, can He claim any personal property in the sufferings of the human nature. On this ground alone, the sufferings and blood of the human nature are the sufferings and blood of the Divine nature; because on this ground the whole complex person suffered.

The reader will frequently meet in the following pages with this and similar language: 'The Scriptures refer suffering and death to the Divine nature of Christ.'* But let him not misunderstand the writer in these instances. Though the Scriptures do this, (this is the fact,) His complex person is always understood, of which the Divine nature is the most important part.

The complex person of the Savior is analogous to that of man. When a man dies, the soul and body suffer together till the separation takes place, when the soul performs its wonted functions, without the medium of material organs. Those who are accustomed to view death, or rather the effect of death, in a lifeless, clay-cold body, are startled at the thought of our Savior's dying, as though it implied that the Deity ceased to exist, or his life became extinct. Unworthy thought! Does even the soul of a man cease to exist, or become extinct when he dies? Does it not often exert its powers in a higher degree, while passing through those sufferings which are commissioned to dissolve its mysterious connection with the body, than at any former period? And, after death, does it not exist in a more perfect state, and act in a more perfect way than it did before? All this, and more, is true in the superlative degree, with the Divine nature, in the sufferings and death of Christ. The sufferings and death of Jesus Christ did not prevent His perceptions, nor take from Him the power to act in all things as became the God-man, Mediator. All the parts of His complex person suffered together till death, when pain ceased, and the soul and Divine nature, closely and indissolubly united, passed together into paradise, where they remained till their reunion with the body. So that neither in the sufferings before death, nor in death itself, nor in the state after death, do we see any thing that need impair the faculties, or in any way prevent the exercise of the powers of his intelligent and efficient nature.

We have seen above that the actions and sufferings of a complex person must be the actions and sufferings of all the parts of which

* The reader is not to understand from this expression that the *Divine nature* of Jesus Christ ceased either to *be*, to *live*, or to *act*, as neither of these can ever be truly declared of His human soul, or of His Divinity; but the meaning is, that for a short season only—from the time that Jesus Christ expired on the cross until His resurrection—His soul and Divinity were separated from the body; so that during that time He ceased to appear in the complex character of God-man, and ceased to perform any of those visible works which pertained to Him as the Redeemer of the world. No one, therefore, is authorized to attribute to the author the belief, that the Deity of Jesus Christ actually expired upon the cross, because nothing is more foreign from his thoughts.

that person is composed; for, otherwise, the parts being separated, the identity of person is destroyed, and we have not one person, but two.

Man is a complex person, made up of spirit and matter, or soul and body; and each action and suffering is the action and suffering of the whole person. It is true that the actions and sufferings of a complex person may in various respects differ. This may have its origin in, and may immediately affect the body; that, the soul. But still the action or suffering belongs to the whole person. The action of eating, for example, is the immediate action of the body; and yet we do not say the body eats, but the man or person eats; and no other idea enters into our minds. It is true we sometimes speak of an action or suffering, as the action or suffering of the body or of the mind, to designate the nature, or some circumstance of it; but never to exclude the other component parts of the person. We also say of a *man* that '*he* endures great pain of body, or is in agony of mind.' And this is the most common as well as the most proper way of speaking; because when one part suffers, all the parts suffer with it, on account of the union subsisting between them. And thus we speak of the death of a person. We do not say that the body died, or that the soul died, but the *man* died; by which we mean that the soul and body suffered together up to a certain point, when the union was dissolved, the body becoming a lifeless mass, and the soul existing in a separate state. Thenceforth we speak neither of the body nor of the soul, as the man, but of each separately and distinctly, as when we say, at death, the body 'returns to the earth as it was, and the spirit returns to God who gave it.' The truth is, that while the soul and body remain united, neither can act or suffer alone. If the body acts or suffers, the soul acts or suffers with it; if the soul acts or suffers, the body acts or suffers with it; and thus the action or suffering is the action or suffering of the whole person.

And thus it is with our adored Mediator. He is a complete person, made up of body, and soul, and essential Divinity. These three, mystically united, constitute the one person of the Mediator; and henceforth all His actions and sufferings are the actions and sufferings of the whole person of the Mediator thus constituted. But as the present argument does not so much relate to the actions as to the sufferings of Jesus Christ, I will confine it to the latter; because if these belong to His whole person, there will be no dispute about His actions.

So far are the Scriptures from limiting the sufferings of Jesus Christ to His human nature; and so important were the sufferings of His whole complex person in order to our redemption, that they frequently refer His sufferings, and even His death, to the Divine nature. Not that unincarnate Deity can suffer, as was said before, or that the human nature was excluded from sharing in His sufferings: but so important were the sufferings of the Divine, in union with the human nature, that they are made prominent, and are chiefly, though not wholly, regarded.

Thus St. Paul:—'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself, likewise, took part of the same: that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil: and deliver them who through fear of death were all

their lifetime subject to bondage. For verily, He took not on Him the nature of angels, but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren; that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He *Himself* hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted,' Heb. ii, 14–18.

Let it be remarked here, 1. That the person spoken of throughout this passage is the same 'who took flesh and blood,' or as St. John expresses the same sentiment, 'was made flesh;' by which we understand the Divine nature or Deity of Jesus Christ. 2. The personal pronoun *He*, throughout the whole passage, refers to the Divine nature, its antecedent. It was that which 'took flesh and blood—that through death (His own death) He might destroy death,' &c. At the 18th verse this is made emphatical,—For, in that 'He *Himself* hath suffered,' &c. 3. At the 9th verse death is said to have been the object for which 'He was made lower than the angels.' This must, therefore, be decisive of the point. 4. The suffering of death is one of the things affirmed of Him. It follows, therefore, either that the Divine nature suffered alone, or that it suffered in union with the human nature. But as the suffering spoken of was posterior to the incarnation, and the Scriptures in many places refer his sufferings to the complex person, I have no doubt the apostle intended that here. The sentiment that the Divine nature did not suffer, stands directly opposed to the spirit and grammatical construction of the whole passage.

The same apostle has a remarkable passage in his Epistle to the Philippians, chap. ii, 6–8:—'Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made *Himself* of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, *He humbled Himself*, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.'

Remark, 1. The person 'who was in the form of God'—'who thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' was the Divine nature, or Deity of Jesus Christ. In this all sound Christians are agreed. 2. The same Divine person who 'took upon Him the form of a servant' became obedient unto death. This is clearly shown by the connecting particles. I say as before, the spirit and grammatical construction of the passage require this meaning to be given to it. How would it answer to read this, and many other passages, as they understand them who exclude the Divine nature from all participation in suffering? He who 'was equal with God, made Himself of no reputation—took upon Him the form of a servant—was made in the likeness of men,' 'humbled Himself,' and He, the *human* nature, died, 'even the death of the cross.' There is now a palpable violation of the rules of language, and the passage becomes a new text in the Bible.

The appellation *Christ*, is used not only as the name of our blessed Savior, but whenever used it regards him as a complex person,—I mean that it is never used for the human nature alone, nor for the Divine nature alone, but always for the two natures united. This is evident, because it designates Him as the *Savior*, and the Savior is constituted by the union of the human and Divine natures in one person. As often, therefore, as it is asserted in Scripture that *Christ*

suffered or died, my proposition is sustained, that not a part, but the whole person of our Savior suffered and died. Thus:—'Ought not Christ to have suffered these things,' Luke xxiv, 46: 'That Christ should suffer He hath so fulfilled,' Acts iii, 18: 'Opening and alleging that Christ must needs have suffered,' Acts xvii, 3: 'In due time Christ died for the ungodly,' Rom. v, 6: 'Christ died for us,' verse 8.

The passages which speak of the sufferings and death of Christ are too numerous to be recited here. Now, if these passages designate the God-man, two natures in one person, then it follows that neither the human nor the Divine nature suffered alone or apart from the other, but that the whole *person* suffered. The reason is clear, neither the human nor the Divine nature alone is Christ, but both united in one person.

The same is to be observed of all the appellations given to our Redeemer; because they all regard him as God-man, the two natures united in one person. And whatever is affirmed of this person, whether action or suffering, is affirmed of the whole person, and not of the human or Divine nature exclusively. The appellations Jesus Christ, Messiah, Savior, Redeemer, Son of God, Son of man, Lamb of God, Man, God, &c., apply to Him as a complex person, and to His actions and sufferings as the actions and sufferings of His whole person.

The glorious personage who appeared to St. John in the isle of Patmos, and conversed with him, is allowed, on all hands, to be the Divine Savior, the God-man Jesus Christ, though he speaks as God, or in His Divine nature. He speaks as no man or created being can speak: 'I am the First and the Last, the ALMIGHTY.' An inspired apostle pays him religious homage: 'To Him be glory and dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' Yet the same apostle tells us that it was He who 'washed us from our sins in His own blood,' and calls Him the 'first begotten from the dead.' And when the apostle 'fell at His feet as dead,' He laid His 'right hand upon him' saying, 'Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am He that liveth and was *dead;* and behold I am alive for evermore,' Rev. chap. i. How it is possible to understand this language of the human nature alone, is to me inconceivable.

St. John in his Gospel, chap. x, 17, 18, records the following words of our Savior: 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life, that I may take it again. No man taketh it from me, *but I lay it down of myself: I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.*'

The character of the person who speaks here is to be known from what is spoken. And who beside the God-man Jesus Christ has 'power to lay down his life, and power to take it again?' If we allow that a man has power to lay down his life, yet no man has power to take his life again, that is, to raise himself from the dead. Beside, if to lay down, and take again the life of the mere *man*, was all that was required of the Son of God, He could have accomplished this without becoming incarnate. And let it be remarked, that if the mere human nature suffered, there was a separation of the two natures, and the Divinity was as truly unincarnate, as before the union took place. But that there was no separation of the two natures appears from the

use of the personal pronouns 'I,' and 'my:' 'I have power to lay down *my* life,' which could not be used by the one nature for, or of, the other. This would be such a violation of the rules of language and propriety as nothing would justify. It follows that the person who speaks and who lays down his life was the Divine Son of God.

But, who has power to lay down his life? We must take the word power in this case to imply *right*, as well as power; for otherwise, to lay down life would be a lawless and vicious act. Who then, I ask, has the right to lay down his life? We are warranted in saying that no man, that no created being has this right. Creatures, whatever may be their rank, are dependent for their existence, and have no right to lay it down. It is true, that when God requires it, it is their duty to submit; but they have no right to be voluntary in this matter. Voluntarily to lay down life would be a violation both of the law of nature and of God. And God can only require this in the case of those who have sinned, and thereby forfeited life and every blessing. He cannot require creatures who never sinned to lay down their life. The supposition shocks us. Before their existence they had done nothing to deserve being created at all. Their creation rose from the *goodness* of God: and after their creation, if they had not transgressed, the same goodness, and even justice would forbid the infliction of punishment. Death is punishment of the most painful and terrible kind, and could not be inflicted where it was not *deserved*. But Jesus Christ volunteered His life for our redemption. He said, 'Here am I, send me!' It is true, the Father is represented as sending his Son to die for sinners. But this sending is predicated of the voluntary offer of the Son. God *accepted* the offer, but could not *require* the service. He could not require it, His Son being innocent. It is contrary to all our ideas of moral justice to *require* the innocent to suffer for the guilty. If then God could not require this of His Son, He being infinitely innocent and pure, and if no creature has a right voluntarily to lay down his life; in what point of light are we to view the act of Christ when He says, 'I have power, that is, right as well as power, to lay down my life?' Clearly, we must view it as the act of an independent being, that is, as the act of God. As God He had a right which no creature has or can have, and might, if he pleased, lay down His life for the transgressors.

It was necessary that the sufferings of Christ should be voluntary, to become either meritorious or just; and to be voluntary it was necessary that He should be God: whence it is that He adds so emphatically, *No man taketh my life from me, but I lay it down of* MYSELF: *I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it again.* In this language we hear the voice of one who is greater than man, we hear the voice of God.

'Our Lord's receiving this commandment of the Father is not to be considered as the ground of His power (or right) to lay down and resume His life; for this He had in *Himself*, and therefore He had an original right to dispose thereof, antecedent to his Father's command or commission: but this commission was the reason why He thus used His power in laying down His life.' (Coke *in loc.*)

I will only farther remark upon this text that it is evidently the language of one who is more than human,—it is the language of

the whole complex person of our Lord; and if so, it clearly follows that the death spoken of was also the death of the same complex person: otherwise He must be understood as saying, 'I have power to lay down the life of that part of myself which is human, and I have power to take it again.' But this would be to make a new text, and introduce a solecism where our Savior is most explicit and emphatical.

In 1 John iii, 16, we read, 'Hereby perceive we the love of God, because He laid down His life for us.' After all the criticisms upon this text; and though the phrase, *of God*, is not in it, 'yet,' says Dr. Clarke, 'it is necessarily understood.' It is only necessary to remark here that *God* or *Christ* must be in the text, and it makes no matter which. If *God* be in the text, the Divine nature of Christ must be understood; if Christ, we know that He is both God and man, united in one person. So that whether God or Christ be in the text, we have both God and man. It follows, then, that suffering is predicated of the Divine nature as the most important part of the complex person of our blessed Savior. Nothing less than this can preserve the text.

A similar passage is found in Acts xx, 28: 'Feed the flock of God which He has purchased with His own blood.' Few passages have divided critics and commentators more than this. The manuscripts and versions, says Dr. Clarke, give three readings—'the Church of God;'—of 'the Lord;' and of the 'Lord and God.' Mr. Wakefield, as Dr. C. observes, is for retaining the common version thus far,—*feed the flock of God*, but varies the following phrase thus—*by His own Son.* But all my readers will agree with Dr. C. in his remark here. 'But as the redemption of man is, throughout the New Testament, attributed to the sacrificial death of Christ, it is not likely that this very unusual meaning should apply here. At all events, we learn here that the Church was purchased by the blood of Christ; and as to His Godhead, it is sufficiently established in many other places.—When we grant that the greater evidence appears to be in favor of, *Feed the Church of the Lord which He hath purchased with His own blood;* we must maintain that, had not the Lord been GOD, His blood could have been no purchase for the souls of a lost world.' So that which ever reading be adopted, the conclusion will inevitably be, that the sufferings of the Divine nature of Christ were considered by the apostle of such great importance, that they seem to be referred to that alone.

The Scriptures make the sufferings of the Redeemer the ground of His exaltation, and His exaltation the reward of His sufferings. In Phil. ii, 8–11, the apostle having told us that He who 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God, humbled Himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,' goes on to say: 'Wherefore, God also hath highly exalted Him, and given Him a name that is above every name, that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father.'

Here let it be remarked, that the apostle is not speaking of the natural dignity and exaltation of the Son of God, but of an exaltation founded on His humiliation and sufferings. If the whole complex

person of our Redeemer is exalted, it follows that the whole suffered. If the Divine nature is exalted, it follows that the Divine nature suffered. If the human nature is exalted, then it will follow that the human nature suffered: because the suffering lays the foundation for the exaltation, and the exaltation is the reward of the suffering. The rule is a definite one, and cannot mislead us. It establishes the connection between the suffering and the exaltation, so that if any part of the complex nature of the Redeemer did not suffer, it is undeniable that that part could not be exalted as a reward of suffering. It would be altogether unreasonable and absurd to say that one part of a complex being is exalted as a reward for the suffering of another part. But allowing that the human nature alone suffered, it will follow, according to the rule, that the human nature alone is exalted, and that too to the rank and character of Deity, and as such receives the homage of every rational creature in heaven and on the earth. But no person can be so exalted as a reward for suffering but He who is essentially God; because none but God can be worshipped.

This will introduce another thought. He who suffered and died for the sins of the world is now actually worshipped by all the heavenly host, in conjunction with all them who have been redeemed from their sins, who are on the earth. Let the reader here consult the whole of the 5th chapter of the Revelation, especially the following passages:

'And I beheld, and lo, in the midst of the throne, and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain, having seven horns and seven eyes, which are the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth. And when He had taken the book, the four beasts, and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints. And they sung a new song, saying, Thou art worthy to take the book and to loose the seals thereof: for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation! And I beheld and heard the voice of many angels, &c, saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I, saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.'

Let the reader observe here, *first*, that the worship paid to the Lamb proves Him to be God. *Secondly*. The Lamb, the person who received this worship, had been *slain*. If this is not evidence that the Deity of Jesus Christ suffered, His being slain does not imply suffering.

Having thus far advanced the Scripture evidence in support of the position that the whole complex person of our Lord suffered in redeeming a guilty world, it may not be amiss to show what our Church in her 2d article teaches on this subject:—

'The Son, who is the Word of the Father, the very and eternal God, of one substance with the Father, took man's nature in the womb of the blessed virgin; so that two whole and perfect natures, that is to say, the Godhead and manhood, were joined together in one person,

never to be divided, whereof is one Christ, very God and very man, who truly suffered, was crucified, dead and buried, to reconcile the Father to us, and to be a sacrifice, not only for original guilt, but also for actual sins of men.'

In this we have a plain description of our Lord's person, as 'very God and very man, two whole and distinct natures united in one person,—*never to be divided*;' of which person it is said that He 'suffered, was dead and buried.' Note, that the *person* of Christ, not a part only, suffered and died. This is not the same as saying that the Divine, or the human nature suffered and died. Before the union of the two natures, each constituted a distinct person; but by the union they are brought into one, and form a complex person, which has personal identity. What might be affirmed of each before the union is one thing, and what after the union, another. It could not be affirmed of the Divine nature before the union of the two natures, that it suffered and died; nor can it be affirmed of the Divine nature, after the union, that *it* suffered and died; but this may be affirmed of the *person* composed of the two natures. And this is affirmed in the article. But if the human nature alone suffered, the complex person did not suffer, but only a part of it,—the identity of person is destroyed, and we have not one, but two *whole and entire persons*; one of which suffered, the other not. On this ground the two natures are as truly separate, as they were before the incarnation. For neither the human nor the Divine nature alone constitutes the identity of our Savior's person, but both united.

The opinion that the union of the two natures continued while only one suffered; and that the sufferings of the human nature were, *therefore*, the sufferings of the Divine nature, while the latter suffered nothing, has been adopted prematurely. If the identity of the complex person of Christ remained during His sufferings, He might, with propriety, speak of *His* blood shed for the many, and of *His* life which *He* gave for the world; for in that case the whole complex person suffered. But if the two natures were divided, and the Divine did not suffer with the human nature, then nothing can justify *His* claiming the merit of suffering, or calling the blood shed *His* blood. We must therefore admit that the whole complex person of our Lord suffered, or give up the article under consideration.

I might here also urge, as a reason why the Methodists especially ought to receive this doctrine, that it is contained in the hymns which the Church has given to assist our devotions. Many of our hymns contain the sentiment, and that unequivocally expressed, that the Divine nature participated with the human in those sufferings by which the world was redeemed. Thus the 187th hymn:—

'O Love Divine, what hast thou done!
The immortal God hath died for me!
The Father's co-eternal Son
Bore all my sins upon the tree—
The immortal God for me hath died:
My Lord, my Love, is crucify'd.'

See also the 196th hymn—

'Lo, the powers of heaven He shakes,
Nature in convulsion lies;

Earth's profoundest centre quakes—
The great JEHOVAH dies.'

I will quote only one more, though I might many. Hymn 191:—

'Well might the sun in darkness hide,
And shut his glories in,
When Christ, the mighty MAKER died,' &c.

There are but two ways to account for this language of our hymns. The first is, by considering it as highly figurative, and thus resolving it into the license granted to poets. In reply it may be said that it was never conceded to poets to give false sentiment. Figures are used in poetry for illustration and embellishment, and are the garb of sentiment. But if the sentiment that the Divine nature did not suffer with the human in obtaining our redemption, be true, no license could ever make the use of this language either correct or safe.

The other way of accounting for this language is to consider it as referring to the complex person of our Savior, the most important part of which is the Divine nature. If, however, the sentiment that the whole person of our Savior suffered, be incorrect, the voice of the Church can be no authority in the case. But while she is so clearly Scriptural in her hymns, and is allowed to be so by all her ministers, as well as other members, it becomes us to receive her instruction and defend her doctrine.

Having heard the voice of the Scriptures and that of our own Church on this sublime and important point, it may not be amiss to hear what two of the greatest divines that have lived since the Reformation have also said upon it, I mean the pious and learned Richard Baxter, and the Rev. J. Wesley.

Mr. Baxter's sentiment is to be found in his Aphorisms of Justification, Thesis vii :—

'The will of the Father and Son are one: the Son was a voluntary undertaker of this task: (the satisfying for the sins of men.) It was not imposed upon Him by constraint: when He is said to come to do His Father's will it doth also include His own will. And when He is said to do it in obedience to the Father, as it is spoken of a voluntary obedience, so it is spoken of the execution of our redemption, and in regard to the human nature especially; and not by the understanding of the Divine nature *alone*. Not only the consent of Christ did make it lawful that He should be punished being innocent; but also that special power which, as He was God, He had over His own life more than any creature hath; "I have power," saith Christ, "to lay down my life," John x, 18.

'No mere creature was qualified for this work: even the angels that are righteous do but their duty, and therefore cannot supererogate or merit for us. Neither were they able to bear and overcome the penalty.

'It must therefore be God that must satisfy God; both for the perfection of the obedience, for dignifying of the duty and suffering, for to be capable of meriting, for the bearing of the curse, for the overcoming of it, and doing the rest of the works of the Mediatorship, which were to be done after the resurrection. Yet *mere* God it must not be, but man *also:* or else it would have been forgiveness without satisfaction, seeing (mere) God cannot be said to make satisfaction to Himself.'

I know not that any remarks or exposition here are needed, or that the sentiment can be made any plainer. The author has expressed himself clearly and guardedly; and if there be any definite meaning in words, the sentiment is, that neither the human nor Divine nature suffered alone, but both together, and the reasons are given—*man could not merit—could not bear and overcome the curse;* it must therefore be God for these purposes, and for doing the other works of the Mediatorship. Mere God it must not be, but man *also*, or God and man united.

The sentiment of Mr. Wesley is the same with the above; for he published an abridgment of the Aphorisms of Baxter, retaining this paragraph, and thereby stamping it with his approbation.

Having thus briefly considered what may be said in favor of the proposition, that all the actions and sufferings of Christ, after the union of the two natures, were the actions and sufferings of His whole complex person, I will consider what may be said in objection to it.

Objection 1. 'It is said in the Scriptures that Jesus Christ was put to death in the *flesh;*—that He shed His blood for us; and the Scriptures in many places teach that He suffered as *man:* what propriety is there then in involving the Divine nature in suffering? If the Scriptures teach that He suffered as *man*, what authority have we to say He suffered as God?'

Answer 1. The Scriptures do indeed teach that Jesus Christ suffered as man, but nowhere teach that He suffered *only* as man, or that He did not suffer as God and man united.

2. The Scriptures call our blessed Savior the man Christ Jesus,—the Son of man, and the man of sorrows; and therefore, if we reason like the objector, we must say with the Socinian that he was a *mere* man, and the account of the incarnation is all a fable. The argument in the one case is as good as in the other.

3. If the phrase, 'suffered in the flesh' is to be understood as excluding the Divine nature, it must exclude also his human soul; and then we have this sentiment, that the sufferings of Jesus Christ were merely corporeal, neither His soul nor the Divine nature having any share in them.

4. Whatever appellation is given to our Savior, whether man or God, Son of man, or Son of God, must be understood as designating His whole complex person; because it is previously ascertained and admitted that both the human and Divine natures are united in His person. Accordingly the sufferings of the *man Christ Jesus*, are the sufferings of His whole complex person; and when it is said that the Alpha and Omega died,—that He who thought it not robbery to be equal with God became obedient unto death, it is to be understood in the same way, of the whole complex person. There is then no evidence whatever that the human nature alone suffered; seeing the Scriptures refer His suffering indifferently to the Divine or human nature.

Objection 2. There were certain conditions or states in the life of Christ, in which the inter-communication between the two natures must have been suspended, and in which the human nature alone could have been concerned; as when He is represented as 'increasing in wisdom and stature,' (which imply a state of ignorance and weakness,) as

sleeping and in death. And if in these states the Divine nature could not partake with the human, the same may have been true in other cases; especially in respect to suffering, where we should expect the inter-communication between the two natures would be suspended. There is therefore no absurdity in saying this, 'He *suffered* as man, that He *spoke* and *acted* as God!'

Answer. It is not pretended that the proposition defended in this Essay has no difficulties attending it; but these difficulties may not be in the doctrine of an inter-communication in suffering, but in our limited faculties, and the narrow capacity of our minds. I reason in this case as the believers in the doctrine of the trinity and the incarnation of the Son of God have always done. These doctrines we cannot explain, but we believe them, notwithstanding, on the evidence of Divine revelation. Do we act consistently then when we object to the doctrine of inter-communication in suffering in the case of our Saviour, merely because it is attended with difficulties?

The only question to be settled here is, Is this doctrine taught in the Bible? Do the Scriptures inform us that the whole person of our Lord suffered for our redemption? To my understanding they do, and that with a clearness of evidence not to be resisted. It is true we cannot tell *how* the whole complex person of our Savior increased in wisdom and stature; *how* he slept; *how* he died; or what was in all respects his state in death. And were we to limit the inquiry to the mere human nature, we shall find inexplicable difficulties. Who can tell *how* the complex creature, man, increases in wisdom and stature—sleeps and dies; or what is precisely his condition in these several states? These conditions of man, as far as they affect the body, are submitted to the observation of our senses; but who can tell how the soul is affected in them? And yet we know that the man grows, sleeps, and dies, and not merely the body. Even so the complex person of Christ increased in wisdom and stature, slept and died, though we cannot tell, precisely, what was His condition in either of these states, or how all the parts of His person were affected by them. Important reasons are assigned for his passing through every state or condition of human beings: 'Wherefore in all things it behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren; that He might be a merciful and faithful High Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people,' Heb. ii, 17. Here we are taught that it was highly expedient, that our atoning High Priest should pass through all the states, passive as well as active, to which human creatures are subjected, that He might be a propitiation for their sins, and sanctify every state and condition lying in their path to heaven. Again it is said, 'We have not a High Priest who cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities; but was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin. Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need,' Heb. iv, 15, 16. In order that He might be our sympathizing High Priest, He consented to be tempted in all points like as we are; but as a great part of our temptations grow out of, and are connected with those and other states, through which we are destined to pass, He consented also, in all things, to be made like unto His brethren, by passing through them Himself. And what Christian does not con-

tinually thank God that he is not required to travel a way his Savior never trod? And how cheerfully we sing,—

> 'The graves of all the saints He bless'd,
> And sweeten'd every bed;
> Where should the dying members rest,
> But with their dying Head.'

Objection 3. There was no necessity for the Divine nature to suffer. The human nature derived infinite dignity and value from its union with the Divine, and its sufferings were therefore sufficient for the redemption of mankind, without the sufferings of the Divine nature.

Answer 1. This method of deriving merit is no where taught in the Bible, nor is it consonant to reason, as being that, on account of which we are redeemed, justified, and saved.

2. Worthiness or merit is not derived in this way. The condescension of a superior to an inferior, adds nothing to the real dignity and worthiness of the latter. The merit is his who condescends; and the greater the difference in the dignity and character of the two persons, the greater the condescension and merit. Merit, in the present case, is so far from belonging to the human nature, by derivation, that it is every where in Scripture, and by the whole Church, attributed to the Divine nature, and never would have been ascribed to the human had the sentiment been properly investigated. Was there ever a person, since the Savior was announced from heaven, who in his devotions and prayers admitted this view of merit—human merit thus derived? Are we not taught to look to Christ, and not merely to His human nature, for salvation, and to offer all our prayers and thanksgivings in *His* name, on His account, for His sake? Surely a sentiment which we cannot practise upon in our devotions should have no place in our creed. The truth is, that merit is wholly from the dignity of the Divine nature, and from His humiliation and obedience unto death.

Objection 4. The grand objection to the doctrine of this Essay is this: It is said that 'Jesus Christ could not suffer in his Divine nature; that happiness is an essential attribute of the Divine nature, and of course the possibility of His suffering is excluded.'

Answer. It is not clear to my understanding that happiness is an essential attribute to the Divine nature, or that it is an attribute in the sense that integrity or holiness is. It appears that the happiness of the Deity is rather a result, so to speak, of the perfection of His nature and the rectitude of His conduct. God cannot be otherwise than holy: He cannot do wrong. But if He is pleased voluntarily to dispense with His happiness for a time, in view of accomplishing the greatest possible good to the universe, I can see no objection to His doing so. In thus suspending for a time His happiness, He violates no principle of moral holiness, nor departs in the least from infinite rectitude.

And is it not too much for us short-sighted creatures to say, that He cannot suffer pain, when He tells us in so many words, that 'He has power to lay down his life?' and that He 'took flesh and blood for the purpose of suffering death?'

Those who say the Divine nature did not suffer, seem not to be

aware of what their words imply. Did He not suffer an eclipse of His glory when He became incarnate, and appeared in the form of a servant? But perhaps it is meant that He could not suffer pain. By what reasoning or argument this distinction can be made to appear, I know not. Cannot an infinite being suffer pain as well as suffer an eclipse or obscuration of his glory? But waiving this, let us consider the assertion that the Deity 'cannot suffer.'

Was not the life of our blessed Savior upon earth made up chiefly of suffering and pain? Was there no suffering implied in His taking our nature and infirmities, and in bearing our sicknesses? Was there no suffering implied, when He 'who was rich became poor, (*emptied Himself,*) that we through His poverty might become rich?' Was there no suffering, when He who was in the bosom of the Father left that felicity for a stable and a manger? Did the Son of God suffer no pain when extreme poverty placed His condition below the foxes which have holes, and the birds of the air which have nests? Was He a stranger to weariness and thirst? Did He not conflict with the powers of darkness, and endure the most painful temptations from His adversary the devil? Was He not reviled, and slandered, and persecuted by the very beings He came into the world to save? Did He not resist unto blood, striving against sin? Was the Divine nature present with the human, and did it suffer nothing during His bloody agony in the garden? If present, how did He support the human nature in the sense of the objector, when He was appalled, dismayed, and overwhelmed, with the weight of what He felt, and what He anticipated? And what support did the Divine nature administer to Him, when upon the cross He cried with a loud voice to the Father, 'My God! My God! why hast thou forsaken me—and gave up the ghost?' Did the Son of God feel no pain when He was betrayed by one of His disciples, denied by another, and forsaken by all? Did He feel no pain when, as the King of the Jews, He was insultingly confronted with false witnesses, scourged, crowned with thorns, and crucified? Or did He suffer all these things as man only? Let the convulsions of nature speak, and let their voice be heard. Suffering made up and terminated the life of Christ upon earth; and shall we still be told that all these pains were suffered by His mere human nature? Yes, this is the objection. But where was the Divinity all this time? If it forsook the humanity in its suffering, we have a *human* Savior indeed: if the two natures remained united in one person, they were one in suffering.

We have not done with the objection, and on one condition will admit its validity: If it was the humanity which was rich, and for our sakes became poor; if it was the humanity which was in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God, but made itself of no reputation, took the form of a servant, &c; if it was the mere humanity (called 'the Lord thy God') which was tempted in the wilderness; if the *Messiah* who, thirsty and weary, sat upon the well, and conversed with the woman of Samaria, was the mere humanity of Christ; if the 'Alpha and Omega,' who was 'dead,' and the 'Lamb who was slain,' were the mere *humanity*, then I will acknowledge the objection to be valid.

It seems not to be considered by the objector that the humiliation of the Divine Word consisted, not merely in His becoming incarnate,

but in His becoming incarnate for a special purpose, namely, that He might do and suffer all that was necessary for the redemption of the world; and that after the union of the two natures, whatever is done or suffered, is done or suffered by the person thus constituted, and not merely by a part of it. If we say that Jesus Christ did not suffer in his Divine nature, for what purpose did He take human nature? Was it that He might perform certain actions which imply no suffering? *They* imply this who say the Divine nature did not suffer. But where do we learn this? In what part of the word of God is it to be found? It surely is not where the Father saith, 'Awake, O sword, against my *Shepherd*, against the *Man* that is my fellow, saith the Lord!' Who is the Shepherd here but *He* who had life in Himself, and had power to lay it down, and who did actually lay it down for the sheep? The Man here spoken of was the '*Fellow*' of the Almighty. But who is the fellow or companion of the almighty Father but the Divine Son?

I would ask the objector, whether the Son of God, by becoming incarnate, was not 'made under the law,' the moral as well as the ceremonial, and that for the double purpose of obeying its precepts and suffering its penalty? If he says yes, there is an end of the controversy; if no, I would ask him to inform us in what sense, and for what purpose He *was made under the law?* Was it the human nature alone that redeemed us from the curse of the law, by being made a curse for us? Or was the Divine nature, in union with the human, made under the law *without* being made a *curse* for us? To be *under the law* is the birth-right of every human being; but the phrase, to be '*made under the law*, is no where used to express the natural condition of man, as a subject of law; but implies the special act of the Deity, in subjecting the Son of God to the condition of mankind, with reference to the law which requires obedience, or suffering the penalty for disobedience, and which in the case of our Redeemer required both obedience, and suffering the penalty of our disobedience. If then the Divine nature in union with the human was made under the law, that He might redeem us from its curse, on what ground of truth or propriety can we say the Divine nature did not suffer?

If Jesus Christ suffered only in His human nature, notwithstanding the language of the Scriptures is so full and explicit on the point, I cannot see that we have any definite rule to guide our inquiries, but every one is left to his own fancy in deciding what was appropriate to the human nature, and what to the Divine. One may say, this thing was proper to be said and done by the human nature, that, by the Divine; and except we allow that the two natures acted and suffered together in the whole work of redeeming sinners, how can we tell what was done by the humanity, and what by the Divinity of Christ?

Is the objection to be understood as lying against all suffering on the part of the Divinity, or only against the principal sufferings, as the agony in the garden, and the passion on the cross? To *all* suffering undoubtedly. For by what rule can it be shown that He can suffer in one degree, and not in two? or in two degrees, and not in three? The objection is, that it is 'impossible for the Deity to suffer,' that is, in any degree. But in the way of this there are insuperable difficulties.

Of the Divinity of Christ it is said, that 'though He was rich, yet

for our sakes He became poor.' This is universally understood to be spoken of the Divinity alone. Man was never rich, but always poor. But the privation of heavenly happiness and glory, and subjugation to poverty, imply suffering in a high degree. This privation and subjugation were not for a particular time or occasion, but for the whole time of our Savior's life upon the earth. And why do we make such a distinction between the actions and sufferings of Christ? Does not action frequently imply suffering, especially such action as we find in the life of our blessed Lord? He took upon Him the form, and sustained the character of a servant: 'I am among you as one that serveth,' are His own words to His disciples. His was a life of laborious action and weariness; so that we may well say,—

'A suffering life my Master led.'

Now if we subtract, not only the greater, but the lesser sufferings from His life, even those of privation and laborious action, what do we leave? Would not this make a blank in His life and character, which we should behold with horror and grief? Would it not be a subversion of His most important offices, as our Redeemer? If we say the Divine nature did not suffer, we leave the human nature to sustain all the suffering necessary for our redemption, and also to perform nearly the whole active service of the Redeemer upon earth. Might we not as well turn Socinians at once, and humanize His person and His actions as well as His pains? But then what shall we do with the Scriptures? Shall we torture and press them into a service they never contemplated? To say nothing of the numerous proofs of His Divinity and incarnation, how shall we understand innumerable passages, which expressly or by implication refer suffering and death to the Divine nature, in connection with the human? For example, How can we understand Acts xx, 28, without admitting the substance of Dr. A. Clarke's comment? 'When we grant,' says he, 'that the greater evidence appears to be in favor of, *Feed the Church of the Lord which He has purchased with His own blood;* we must maintain that, had not this Lord been *God*, His blood could have been no purchase for the souls of a lost world.'

Again. How could we comment Col. i, 18, without admitting the following: 'The *beginning* here mentioned, (*who is the beginning?*) is very different from that spoken of before; and yet *this* beginning, which is His resurrection, is plainly laid down as a foundation of the principality and headship which He holds over the Church. He was the *beginning*, with respect to the creation of all things, being the *Lord*, or *first born of every creature;* He is the beginning and head of the Church, being the *first born from the dead:* the first who ever rose to an endless life. *In all things*, means *in all respects;* not only as the Maker of all things, but as the Mediator raised from the dead.' (*Coke* in loc.)

The passages which cannot be fairly commented without admitting the suffering and death of the complex person of our Savior, are very numerous, and are thus commented on by all sound interpreters of the word of God. I would not however represent that they have all adopted the theory of this Essay; nor can I see how they are consistent with themselves, or with the word of God, when they limit the sufferings of Christ to His human nature.

Thus I have exhibited some of the principal proofs of the proposition with which we started, and have answered all the principal objections which I have either heard or could think of; and must now leave the subject with the candid reader, who would do well to look carefully into it before he decides. And let him reflect that it is one which must be decided by revelation, and not by the reason of man. If the Scriptures teach that the whole complex person of our Savior suffered, that is the truth, and must be received, notwithstanding any difficulties that human reason may not be able to solve. If this is not the doctrine of the Bible it is to be rejected.

The question discussed in the foregoing pages, as it involves the character of the actions and sufferings of Christ, must be allowed to be important. It involves to a high degree the character of God, and the character of man, and the relation and obligations subsisting between them; it stamps the value of the human soul, and exalts, or otherwise, as the question is decided, the whole system of revealed religion. The entire system of revelation rests on the sacrificial death of the Son of God, as a building on its foundation. It has always been the glory of the Christian that he has a Divine and infinite Savior, and he measures his obligations to Him by the dignity of His person, and the labors and sufferings He has sustained in his redemption. He confesses Him in his creed, prays to Him as his God, and praises Him in his songs. And he does right thus to worship his Redeemer. The more highly he exalts His character and sufferings the more acceptable will his worship be, and the greater its saving effect upon his own heart. But let it never be supposed that the writer, in what is here or elsewhere said, supposes that their worship must be defective and unsound who differ from him in their views of the main position of this Essay. He utterly disclaims every sentiment and feeling of the kind; and for any word or sentence that might be so construed, he casts himself on the charity of his Christian brethren, and would ask pardon of God and man.

And may both the reader and writer be permitted to mingle their notes of thanksgiving and praise with that innumerable company who shall sing with a loud voice, '*Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.*' Amen.

T. Merritt.

N. B. As truth, and not victory or novelty, is the object of the foregoing Essay, and as the Scriptures alone can decide whether our Savior suffered in His whole person, or only in a part of it, the writer takes this opportunity to say, that should any one reply to what he has written, he will not feel himself bound to answer, unless his meaning should be misapprehended. If any one will show, by Scripture and sound argument, that his theory and arguments are unsound, he shall have the thanks of the author.

APPENDIX.

After the foregoing Essay was wholly written, I obtained, through a friend, the sight of a volume of sermons and sketches of sermons by the Rev. R. Watson. In Sermon 37th, on 'The Sacrifice of Christ,' I find the main position of the Essay clearly asserted. In showing the superior excellence of the great Christian sacrifice compared with the sacrifices under the former dispensation, he says,—

'But that which carries the value of the offering to its true height,—if we can call that height which is above all height—is, that it was the blood of Christ; of the whole and undivided Christ, who was both God and man. For, though a Divine nature could not bleed and die, a Divine person could. This distinction is to be kept in mind: for the person being one, the acts and sufferings of each nature are the acts and sufferings of the same person, and are spoken of interchangeably.

'Hence it is that the apostle adds, so emphatically, "Who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God." I am aware that some modern commentators apply this to the Holy Spirit; but the fathers and others, more properly, apply it to the Divine nature of our Lord; and in any other view the verse makes a very confused sense. The meaning obviously is, that Christ through, or by means of, His Divine nature,—here called the "eternal Spirit," as in Rom. i, 4, "the Spirit of Holiness," offered Himself, without spot, to God. Nothing less than this could constitute that sacrificial oblation which should take away our sins. But it was done; Divine blood was shed to wash away our sins; and so to demonstrate the Divine justice that we might escape its terrors.

'It is this intimate and inseparable connection of the Divinity of our Lord, this hypostatical union with His person and work, which gives to both that peculiarity which lays the foundation of our absolute faith; and it may be profitable to dwell a short time upon it.

'It is this which invests His humanity with that Divine character; so that by virtue of the personal union we worship Him, without idolatry, as God. Thomas touches His very flesh; and yet falls at His feet, and cries, "My Lord, and my God!"

'It is this which gives to His teaching its absolute and immediate authority. The lips of the man do but speak the oracles of the enshrined Divinity within. In the prophets, the stream of inspiration comes through the channel of holy men: in Him it bursts from the fountain-head of Divine and infinite wisdom itself.

'It is this which gives that spotless and unstained clearness and perfection to His example. That example was indeed human, or it could have been no example to us; yet all rested upon the base of a higher nature; all was exalted and glorified by the latent Godhead; like some radiant cloud, softened to human gaze, but still deriving its splendor from the unapproachable light of the very sun which it veils.

'It is this which gives their peculiar character to His miracles. Prophets and apostles wrought miracles in the name of a higher Lord; He wrought miracles in His own name. The virtue was in Himself; and it flowed so that those who touched Him lived.

'It is this which gave to His ministrations a character possessed by none beside. He was not a mere publisher of the good news of pardon and salvation. He was a dispenser of these blessings. He forgave sin in His own right; and conferred at once a title to heaven, and a meetness for its enjoyments.

'It is this which exhibits the peculiar lowliness and abasement of His humiliation; and explains the mysterious words, "Who, though He was rich, yet for our sakes became poor, that we through His poverty might be rich." "Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made Himself of no reputation, and took upon Him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men."

'It is this which gave their mysterious depth to His sufferings. I enter not into the question whether the Divine nature could, by a voluntary act, suffer. That veil is not to be lifted up by mortal speculations. But those sufferings were such as no mere man could undergo.

> 'The last mysterious agony;
> Those fainting pangs, that bloody sweat;'

that sorrow of a spirit which had no sin of its own to sorrow for; that recovery from such a struggle, so as to be able to go through His trial with calm dignity; those words of majesty, "I have power to lay down my life, and I have power to take it up again;" that power to dispense paradise to a fellow sufferer; that voice so loud after so many agonies; that dismissal of His spirit; that life from death, at the streaming forth of which the bodies of saints rose, and appeared in the holy city; all enforce from us the exclamation of the Roman officer, "Truly this *man* was the SON OF GOD!" Thus He offered *Himself* to God; and it was this that gave its special character to His sacrifice, and rendered it such a one as never before had been offered; and of a value so full and infinite, that it needs not to be offered again. "By that one oblation" He hath obtained eternal redemption for us. Such is the foundation of our faith in *this* atonement. The blood by which the Church is purchased is the blood of God.'

In the foregoing extracts the reader will find the main position of the Essay, that the actions and sufferings of Jesus Christ are the actions and sufferings of the God-man; or as Mr. Watson expresses the sentiment, 'the whole and undivided Christ, who was both God and man.' He will find also the same distinction made, in reference to suffering, between the incarnate and unincarnate Divinity. 'Though a Divine nature could not bleed and die, a Divine person could.' Other points of comparison, or rather sameness in the sentiment of the two treatises, I need not point out to the reader. Suffice it to say that Mr. Watson has portrayed the influence of the sufferings and death of the 'whole and undivided Christ,' on experimental and practical piety, in a strain of eloquence peculiarly his own. T. M.

New-York, Feb. 19th, 1835.

AN ADDRESS TO THE YOUNG MINISTERS

WHO WERE ADMITTED INTO FULL CONNECTION WITH THE WESLEYAN-METHODIST CONFERENCE:

Delivered August 6th, 1834, at the City-Road Chapel, London.
By the REV. RICHARD TREFFRY.

MY DEAR BRETHREN,—For more than half a century, the practice has prevailed among us, of furnishing the young men who have been formally admitted into our body with a few words of advice, adapted to their circumstances as Christian ministers. This was formerly done by individuals selected from among our senior preachers; who were supposed, by their age and experience, to be most qualified for the work of giving suitable instruction to their junior brethren in the ministry; and most solicitous that the doctrine and discipline of Methodism, in all their purity and simplicity, might be transmitted to future generations: and I distinctly recollect, thirty-eight years ago, standing at the foot of this pulpit, and receiving such instructions, some portions of which are fresh in my memory even at this day. But in the year 1813, a rule was made, which rendered it imperative upon the president of the conference for the preceding year, to address to the preachers, who had been received into full connection, 'in the presence of the congregation, an appropriate charge.' No apology, therefore, on my part, is necessary, for the liberty I take in speaking to you on the present occasion. May the Lord give us His blessing, and crown this service with His special presence!

When I consider the great responsibility and peculiar perils, incident to the work in which, by the great Head of the Church, you have been called to engage, I feel disposed to select, as the ground of my present remarks, some passage of a specifically cautionary and monitory character; and the more so, because a prevailing consciousness of this responsibility, and a salutary watchfulness against such dangers, will not only be likely to render you secure, but will insure to you a progressive improvement in your personal characters, and your ministerial qualifications. An admonition of St. Paul to Timothy seems very suitable to my purpose. You will find it in the First Epistle to Timothy, the fourth chapter, and the last verse: 'Take heed unto thyself, and unto the doctrine.' The first part of this advice referred to Timothy in his personal, and the second in his ministerial, character; the one to his conduct as a Christian, the other to his office as a preacher. Nor do I know of any advice within the whole range of revelation, that is reiterated more frequently, and in more varied forms of expression, than this, 'Take heed unto thyself.' It is found in the writings of the Old and New Testaments, of the prophets and apostles; and even our Savior Himself deemed it of sufficient importance to leave it on record for the instruction and admonition of mankind. Allow me then to say,—

1. Take heed to your bodies. I do not think it beneath the dignity of this place to remind you that some of the dangers to which you are exposed are such as affect the body. The caution in the text may therefore be naturally supposed to involve the duty of caring for your

health. Timothy was most probably an afflicted man: he had his 'infirmities;' and from the circumstance that St. Paul recommends him to 'use a little wine,' as an antidote to them, we may infer, that they were not moral but physical infirmities, not of mind, but of body. Hence it is evident, that even the apostles themselves were ordinarily bound to employ the usual means for the preservation of health: they could occasionally work miracles, and heal the most inveterate diseases; but they were not always invested with this wonder-working power. Paul could not heal Trophimus, and therefore left him sick at Miletus; nor could Peter heal his wife's mother; nor could Timothy, by any supernatural agency, counteract the influence of his physical infirmities.

It would not be improper in this place to suggest to you the value of health, in promoting your personal comfort. But I prefer to assume a higher ground; and to remind you, that, apart from the considerations of usefulness, health is the highest natural blessing with which you can be entrusted; and your responsibility is proportioned to its importance. If any express Scriptural confirmation of this view were necessary, it might be gathered from the figures employed by the apostle, to illustrate the sanctity of even the bodies of believers. They are, he tells us, 'members of Christ,' and 'temples of the Holy Ghost;' and though the inference which he draws from these representations respects the purity with which our bodies should be preserved, yet a reverent care of them seems equally to be implied in it. If he who defiles the temple of God renders himself a subject of the Divine displeasure, surely he who negligently allows it to fall into decay, or who rudely shakes its walls, cannot hope to be held guiltless.

And if to this consideration you add the claim which God has upon you to employ your health for the special benefit of the Church, the subject rises in importance. As ordinary Christians, you are not your own; you are bought with a price, and on this fact is grounded the duty of glorifying God with your bodies, as well as with your spirits, both of which have been the subjects of this costly purchase. Nay, more: you emphatically are not your own; you have ceded all right to yourselves; you have transferred to the Church of God the claim on all your powers of body and soul. This day have your vows been made in the presence of your brethren; and, having been long betrothed, you are now married to your great office; these vows have tacitly, if not explicitly, bound you to devote your physical powers to the service of the sanctuary; and any prodigal expenditure of your health is a breach of your contract, a contract recognized by the Church in heaven, and registered by the Church on earth. Need I then urge upon you the necessity of the obligation?

You are not the men, I most conscientiously believe, to interpret those cautions as warranting a sickly effeminacy, or an unmanly self indulgence. Some of you have already, for the work of the Lord, been brought nigh unto death; you have been ambassadors to the heathen; and your labors in foreign and inhospitable climes have enervated your frames, and cast a sickly hue upon your countenances; and to one of you I may say, 'You bear about in your body the marks of the Lord Jesus; you have been imprisoned in a colonial jail, for your unflinching adherence to your ministerial duty.' With grateful delight the Church ranks you among her confessors; nor do I doubt,

that, should the period ever arrive, in which others among you shall be called to the endurance of still more severe and more complicated calamities, you will rejoice to be counted worthy to suffer for your Savior's sake.

It must be allowed that a minister's life is a life of peril; and especially a Methodist preacher's life. It is true that in this country he is not in danger from the rude attacks of lawless and riotous mobs; the arm of violence is not now raised against him; he can generally pass unmolested through the land. Yet he is in labors more abundant; he preaches more sermons than almost any other minister, and frequently in houses crowded almost to suffocation: and, after having engaged for hours in the work of his Master, he has to go, streaming with perspiration, into the chilling atmosphere, to face the bitter blast, and encounter the pelting hail, or the drifting snow-storm, in his way to his humble habitation. I was lately in company with a minister of our body, whose 'eightieth year was nigh,' who declared, that he had preached from two to five sermons daily, for six weeks in succession, beside travelling through a great extent of country in the depth of winter. There are many things in a Methodist preacher's itinerant life, which I need not particularize, that can scarcely fail to sap the foundation of the strongest constitution, and destroy the most vigorous health, without a due degree of care and precaution. There may be special cases when self preservation must be merged in the welfare of society, and when physical evil may, by a marvellous process, generate moral good; but health is too serious a thing to be unnecessarily sacrificed. There is a zeal without prudence as well as without knowledge; and he who expends a more than ordinary share of physical and mental energy in the service of the sanctuary, ought to be fully persuaded in his own mind that he is doing God service, and that such a sacrifice will be acceptable in His sight.

Many of you whom I have the honor of addressing are young; your health is good; your constitutions are strong; and your native vigor has never yet been wasted by disease. But young persons, for want of experience, are frequently presumptuous, and presumption induces incaution, and hence they unawares rush into danger. Therefore take heed to yourselves; and while on the one hand you guard against a needless self indulgence, be no less cautious on the other, in watching against a prodigal exhaustion of your physical powers. Afflictions must come; they are the never-failing lot of humanity: but do not antedate their arrival. Consider how easy it is to entail diseases upon your constitutions, which you may carry with you through life, and which may affect posterity no less than yourselves. And should any of you be laid aside from the active duties of itinerancy in the morning of your days, and be obliged to eke out life on the scanty pittance allotted to invalids, then how bitter the reflection will be, that, but for your own culpable imprudence, you might be still sounding forth the word of the Lord, and preaching righteousness to great congregations!

It is foreign from my design to furnish you with rules for the preservation of your health; that is the business of the physician, rather than the preacher. Let it suffice for me to say, that by attention to diet, and exercise, and rest,—by orderly habits, and well-regulated

conduct,—you should labor to ward off the attacks of disease; and if you make these matters the subjects of conscientious care, we may reasonably hope that, in general, you will be, by God's providence, preserved to bless the Church, and enlighten the world.

2. Take heed to your souls. This is naturally suggested by a consideration of their incalculable value. For what is the body to the soul? What is the chaff to the wheat? What is the frail and corruptible casket to the rich and imperishable jewel which it contains? What is a mass of animated mould, however exquisite in organization, or perfect in symmetry, compared to an intelligent spirit, stamped with the indelible character of immortality, and designed by its Creator to flourish in immortal youth, and triumph in existence? And if the care of an object, and the interest for its welfare, should bear a proportion to its excellency and value, how high, how entire, and how all-absorbing, should be the care of your souls!

> 'The soul's high price is the creation's key;
> That is the mighty hinge on which have turn'd
> All revolutions; whether we regard
> The natural, civil, or religious world.'

Every argument which has been employed to induce you to be solicitous upon the subject of your health, is applicable in a higher degree, and with a more commanding emphasis, to this noblest object of human responsibility. Considerations of your own happiness, your high trust, the redeeming work of the Lord Jesus, your vows to God and His Church, all urge upon your attention the great duty of taking heed to your souls.

That you have already regarded the spiritual welfare of your souls, I cannot doubt. You have made a good profession before many witnesses of the Scriptural character of your conversion from the error of your ways. You have acknowledged in the presence of this large congregation, that, though you were as sheep going astray, yet that you are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls; and that you have 'redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace.' Having, therefore, tasted that the Lord is gracious, and been made partakers of the Holy Ghost, take heed that you continue in the grace of God; that you retain a sense of sin forgiven; that you exercise yourselves to have always consciences void of offence toward God and toward men; and that you walk in the light as God is in the light. And this can be done only by making advances in the Divine life, 'pressing toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus,' and 'growing up into Him in all things, which is the head, even Christ,' and seeking deeper baptisms, and larger effusions, of the Holy Ghost. There are many reasons why you should do this. The religion which you profess to enjoy, and which you preach to others, is all progression; it is a conquest that you are to achieve; it is a way in which you are to walk; it is a race you are to run: advancement in it is essential to its retention. He who does not advance must decline. Consistency, therefore, obliges you to practise in yourselves what you press upon the consciences of others. You have also depraved natures; sin may be pardoned and subdued, but it is not wholly extir-

pated; the entail of moral evil is not yet cut off; you may be justified freely without being sanctified wholly; the carnal principle may exist where it is not suffered to reign; but unless you watch and pray, and guard your senses and all the avenues of your heart against temptation, and seek for the utter destruction of the evil of your natures, sin will revive within you; the strong man, armed, will regain possession of his palace; and, after preaching to others, you yourselves will become castaways. Remember, too, that you have a heaven of immortal glory and happiness to secure, and a hell of insufferable pain and punishment to escape. Preaching the Gospel will neither prepare you for the former, nor save you from the latter. You may preach like angels, and yet perish like devils. You may hold the torch of truth to light others to heaven, while you yourselves are sitting in darkness, and in the region of the shadow of death. 'Many,' saith Christ, 'will say unto me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name, and in thy name have cast out devils, and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity.' Many are now in hell, who once warned others against it; and ministers will be saved at last, not because they have been rendered instrumental in saving others, but because they were personally interested in the infinitely meritorious sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. And unless you take heed to your own souls, and retain the savor of piety, how ill-qualified you must necessarily be to watch over the souls of others! How can you discharge the duties of your office, when the spirit of that office is departed from you? How can you travail in birth for the salvation of men, when you are neglecting to work out your own salvation? With what conscience can you declaim against lukewarmness in religion, when you yourselves are at ease in Zion? How can you hope to season others, when the salt that was in you has lost its savor? or expect that God will employ you to enlighten others, when the light that was in you is become darkness? For it must never be forgotten, that ministerial success is wholly of the Lord. 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.' 'Who is he that saith, and it cometh to pass, when the Lord commandeth it not?' 'I have planted,' says St. Paul, 'Apollos watered; but God gave the increase. So then, neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase.' Do you expect God to succeed your labors with His blessing? then maintain communion with Him. God honors them most who honor Him most. The holiest ministers are the most successful instruments of good to society; their prayers are most prevalent with God, and their example is most influential among men. Would you desire, therefore, to turn many to righteousness, and to shine as the stars for ever and ever?—take heed to your souls, keep them with all diligence; watch with godly jealousy over their spiritual interests, and commit the keeping of them to God in well-doing, as unto a faithful Creator.

You must remember, also, that while your office places you under the strongest obligation to cultivate and retain the spirit of true religion in your own souls; it subjects you to dangers from which ordinary Christians are in a great measure free. That very familiarity with

Scripture truth, which may, and ought to be, subservient to your spiritual interests, is apt to generate a formality, both in your own piety, and in the performance of your public duties. It is indeed a difficult thing for a man who is perpetually inculcating the same truths, and in many cases in the same phraseology, to preserve in his own mind a sense of their vast and incalculable importance; and it is morally certain, that unless you keep alive in yourselves the savour of vital piety, your preaching will degenerate into a mere professional performance. You will declare the truths of God's word, and urge the duties of the Christian character, as matters of course. Nay, your public duties may, possibly, be the very means of drawing away your hearts from God; and even before your hearers become conscious of the change, you yourselves may be sensibly shorn of your strength, and become feeble as other men. In such a case, a degree of melancholy self delusion, as to your own state, may in time result from your holy office; and you may succeed in persuading yourselves that your familiarity with the things of God may render less necessary the personal enjoyment of the power of godliness. The bare possibility of such a condition, which, I doubt not, you are convinced is by no means chimerical, should awaken in your spirits the most serious jealousy, and induce you to maintain habits of self examination and devotion, steady and powerful, in proportion to the greatness of the dangers by which you are threatened.

In order to preserve your ministry from vapidness and formality, it is, as I have already suggested, necessary, in the first place, to maintain the spirituality and life of your own Christianity; but a secondary means, of no small efficiency, is the diligent cultivation of your minds. For if one principal danger to which you are exposed arises from your familiarity with Divine truth, an obvious safeguard against it may be found in the effort to give to that truth, both to your own minds, and in your preaching, that variety of form which it is capable of assuming. Hence you may seek the aid of natural science, and of profane history, and successfully lay these under contributions for the illustration of the topics of your ministry. You may find, in the cultivation of a correct style, and of the graces of a modest rhetoric and a chaste elocution, the means to awaken the attention of minds which would repel a discourse that was vulgar in its diction, and in its general manner either dryly abstract, on the one hand, or bombastic on the other. These, however, are minor and subsidiary matters. The prayerful and diligent study of the Bible, the daily research into its meaning and its spirit, with such assistance as you can command, in the writings of our own and of other sound divines, will supply you with all the variety that can be desired. Let me remind you, that the Bible is not a book of texts merely, but a revelation of truth,—truth, which is, in the first place, to imbue your own spirits, and which is then by you to be brought forth before the minds of your congregations. It is your business not only to search for passages on which to ground your discourses, but to endeavor to learn and inwardly digest those great truths with which the Scriptures abound in such amazing variety. Do not fail to seek for expositions and illustrations of Gospel verities in human nature, both in its degenerate and restored state. And in all your pastoral intercourse, endeavor to resemble a skilful medical practitioner, who gathers hints concerning his patients from the color of the cheek, the sparkle

of the eye, or those lightest circumstances which, to an ordinary mind, would pass unnoticed, or not understood. All your attainments must have a practical tendency. Every study which does not directly or indirectly bear upon your great work must be cast aside. The duties of your office are too important and too urgent to allow any indulgence in mere intellectual luxury. You are bound to cultivate your minds; but to what extent finite spirits may improve in knowledge, is known only to God; the provinces of human thought are illimitable; and the capacity of man, for the acquisition of intelligence, surpasses all description, and defies all conjecture.

> 'Brutes soon their zenith reach; their little all
> Flows in at once: in ages they no more
> Could know or do, or covet, or enjoy.
> Were man to live coeval with the sun,
> The patriarch pupil would be learning still;
> Yet, dying, leave his lesson half unlearnt.'

The peculiar and sacred character of that mental improvement which you are bound to cultivate, you yourselves have specifically determined. To it you must give yourselves wholly, as the apostle exhorts Timothy to do, in the verse preceding the text; or, as some critics tell us the passage should be rendered, 'In these things be,'—exist, live in them; let them be your atmosphere, surrounding you on every side, being the very support of your intellectual life, pervading your very being. It is not enough that you meditate upon them, but you are to be absorbed by them, without interruption and without decline.

There are several peculiarities in your circumstances, which render it particularly imperative upon you to devote yourselves to the Scriptural cultivation of your minds. One of these is to be found in the character of the present age. We have done something in common with other Christian societies, and something peculiar to ourselves, in exciting among the people an intense thirst for knowledge. We have encouraged and established Sunday schools, both in our own country and in foreign lands. We have taken a conspicuous part in the distribution of religious tracts; we have established and extended a system of village preaching unexampled in the history of this country. Our venerable founder published a number of cheap elementary books; and in the early volumes of the Arminian Magazine, he inserted original papers and valuable extracts on scientific subjects,—a plan which has been, with more or less efficiency, followed up by succeeding editors. And it cannot be denied, that the knowledge of the people of England has increased to a degree which we cannot adequately appreciate. Shall I say that we have pledged ourselves to keep pace with them? We have done more; by exciting the appetite for knowledge, and awakening dormant intellect from one end of the kingdom to the other, we have bound ourselves to keep in advance of them. It would be a most disgraceful issue of our labors, if we, who were among the first to stir the national intelligence, should now fall into the rear of its movements. Even were it possible that we could be forgetful of our tacit pledges, yet the enlightened clergy of the Church of England, and the pastors of dissenting congregations will not allow the ministry of the Gospel in our country to fall in its character behind the intelligence of the age.

Nor is it to be forgotten, that we, as a connection, have had a share in effecting a great spiritual improvement in our land. In some sense, and with humble gratitude to God, it may be said of us as a Church,—

> 'Hither, as to their fountain, other stars
> Repairing, in their golden urns draw light.'

And if, after we have been instrumental in producing an extensive revival of religion among other Churches, and, through it, an increased intellectual stimulus among other ministers,—if we should now fall into a low intellectual condition, or fail to keep pace with our brethren of other denominations, we might justly be assailed by severe reproach, and our names and places be covered with shame. Far from us be the spirit of unhallowed and proselyting rivalry; yet there is a righteous and pious emulation, which we are bound to cultivate; and when we see Churches around us advancing in sound Scriptural knowledge and religious cultivation, we are called to renewed energy and unusual diligence in the work of the Lord.

I take occasion also to remind you, that with the altered circumstances of the world and the Church, there is a change in your own condition from that of your predecessors; and a change highly favorable to the increased cultivation of your minds. Time was when Methodist preachers had few aids or opportunities for intellectual improvement. A half century ago we were peculiarly itinerant preachers, incessantly travelling from place to place. Our circuits were wide and extensive. Much of the most valuable part of the day was spent on horseback. We had few books, and little time for reading them; while among the people there was comparatively little demand for literary or intellectual accomplishment. The scene is now happily changed: we have time and opportunities for making that improvement which is so imperatively required of us. The same resources as to general knowledge are open to you in common with the people of your charge; while your facilities for theological improvement are superior to theirs. There is a meaning in that arrangement of Providence, which has left you less occupied than your fathers; and God, by thus accommodating your circumstances to your duties, renders those duties imperative upon you in a very high, and extraordinary degree.

3. Take heed to your reputation. 'A good name is rather to be chosen than great riches.' He who has any true love for himself cannot fail to regard his reputation; we naturally desire to stand high in the estimation of those who are the objects of our veneration: there are few so lost to virtue as to be heedless of their characters: we all deprecate the displeasure of our friends; and a Christian minister's character should be prized above all price. Much of his success depends on his reputation; this has an extensive and beneficial effect on society. Many are drawn to the house of God by the attractive influence of reputable ministers; and from their mouth they receive the word with gladness, which is able to save their souls. A preacher may have a fine person, a pleasant voice, an agreeable manner, and a ready utterance; but all this, without a character, is but as 'sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal.' Even if a man's talents do not happen to be of a high order, yet if his hearers are impressed with a conviction that he is deeply pious, that his character is unsullied, that he is labor-

ing in season and out of season to save souls from death, they will receive him as a messenger of the Lord, and hold such in reputation. Then take heed to yourselves. Be all alive to the importance of sustaining a blameless character; a reputation that nothing can tarnish. You may not be always able to escape censure; but you may and ought to live so as not to deserve it.

Nor is the importance of ministerial reputation the only view which this part of our subject suggests. Its delicacy and danger are also to be seriously considered. Remember that the standard by which men in general measure a Gospel minister is much higher than that by which the character of ordinary Christians is determined. You are supposed not only to be ensamples to the flock, but to be more familiar with Christian duty, and more free from temptation, than such as are constantly exposed to the sensualizing influence of the world. Even in the openness and freedom of social intercourse, you are regarded with a jealousy not designedly unkind, but certainly not the less severe and irrepressible. The moral sense of men in general, however obtuse to their own errors, is sufficiently delicate in respect to you; and any failure on your part is almost sure either to lessen you in the esteem of your flock, or to supply them with a license for irregularities in their own conduct, of which they will hardly fail to avail themselves. Suffer me to suggest to you some of the most obvious evils, against which it is necessary, for the sake of your reputation, to guard:—

And in the front of these I may mention levity. I am aware that it may be said, true piety is as cheerful as the day; that a merry heart doeth good like a medicine; that we are to serve the Lord with gladness; and that His statutes are to be our songs in the house of our pilgrimage. But it should be recollected, that Christian cheerfulness is widely different from unsanctified levity. The one is, in its principles and source, spiritual; the other, carnal. The one is the overflowing fountain; the other, the turbid torrent. The one is full of glory; the other, at least in its re-action, full of dejection and sadness. Ministers of the Gospel, above all people upon earth, should be grave, serious men. Whether you regard the sanctity and responsibility of your office, or the deeply degraded and awfully perilous state of the world around you, or the comparative inefficiency of your ministry, you will find sufficient reason for cultivating a deep death-like seriousness of mind. What will the people of your charge, whose souls you are to watch over as they that must give account, think of you, if you promote, wherever you go, a spirit of levity, and evince a fondness for retailing stale, thread-bare anecdotes, only calculated to generate unhallowed mirth? If laughter is madness in any man, it is in a Christian minister, whose sole business is to make people serious; for the first requisite in religion is seriousness, and no impression can be made upon the mind without it.

You may also injure your ministerial reputation by the indulgence of a haughty disposition and carriage. There is no evil in existence so hostile to the spirit and genius of Christianity as pride. Jesus Christ, the founder and pattern of Christianity, was meek and lowly in heart; and He humbled Himself unto death, even the death of the cross. His primitive apostles were adorned with humbleness of mind. The directions which they give to their converts were, 'Be clothed with humility;'

and, 'Humble yourselves under the mighty hand of God.' The 'grace' which God gives is 'to the humble;' and those with whom the Deity deigns to dwell are such as are of 'an humble spirit, to revive the spirit of the humble, and to revive the heart of the contrite ones.' While there are so many incentives to humility, and while you preach that Gospel which is designed by its great Author to abase the proud, and exalt the humble, take heed to yourselves. Let not the foot of pride come against you; guard against the encroachments of this sly, insinuating, busy sin, which, if not resisted, will spoil all that you can do. You cannot be lifted up with pride, without falling into the condemnation of the devil. And no human beings have more temptations to pride than preachers. Their office is the most sublime and dignified upon earth. The titles employed by the Spirit of God to describe their work are indicative of their elevated character. The large and respectable assemblies congregated to hear them,—the high encomiums often bestowed upon their discourses by fawning sycophants, fulsome flatterers or injudicious friends,—and the pride and naughtiness of their own hearts,—all tend to make them think more highly of themselves than they ought to think. 'Pride,' says an old divine, 'indites our discourses for us, chooseth our company for us, forms our countenances, puts accents and emphases upon our words; and when pride hath made the sermon, it goes with us into the pulpit, it forms our tone, and animates us in our delivery; and when the sermon is done, pride goes home with us, and makes us eager to know whether we were applauded or despised.' Think, then, I beseech you, how odious you must appear in the sight of God, and how contemptible in the estimation of your people, if you indulge a haughty disposition. If you sacrifice to your own net, and burn incense to your own drags, if, instead of being tremblingly alive to the awful responsibility of your situation, and the immortal interests of your auditories, you immolate truth at the shrine of popularity, and arrogate to yourselves the praise which is exclusively due to Him who is jealous of His honor, and who will not give His glory to another.

Nor can you fail to injure your ministerial reputation, if you neglect the practice of pastoral duties. 'I have,' says St. Paul to the Ephesian elders, 'taught you publicly, and from house to house.' And your office binds you to adopt the same practice; you must visit the people of your charge, not for the purpose of worldly conversation, nor even merely to sit around their hospitable board, and partake of their bounties; but that you may administer instruction, reproof, or consolation, as their circumstances may require. Some of your people may be suffering affliction: these will need the consolations of religion; for afflictions have a natural tendency to depress the spirits; and at such seasons especially, the corruptible body presseth down the soul. By visiting the chambers of disease, and sitting by the beds of languishment, you may become angels of mercy to the afflicted; you may soothe their sorrows, calm their fears, cheer their dejected spirits; and while weeping with those that weep, you may not only improve the tender sympathies of your own hearts, but be reminded by the solemn scenes around you, that you yourselves will, ere long, need all the consolations which you now seek to administer to others. Some of your flocks will, perhaps, wander from the fold, or be scattered in a cloudy

and a dark day; these must be sought out, and, if possible, induced to return unto the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls. Some may be overtaken in a fault: these should be reproved in the spirit of meekness, considering yourselves, lest you also be tempted. In a word, if you would be ensamples to the flock, you must be blameless and harmless, without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, shining as the lights of the world; that you may rejoice, in the day of Christ, that you have not run in vain, neither labored in vain. And here let me remind you of what our venerated founder has said in those 'Minutes' which you have all most solemnly engaged to make the rules of your conduct: 'O brethren, if we could but set this work on foot in all our societies, and prosecute it zealously, what glory would redound to God! If the common ignorance were banished, and every shop and every house busied in speaking of the word and works of God, surely God would dwell in our habitations, and make us His delight.

'And this is absolutely necessary to the welfare of our people, many of whom neither believe nor repent to this day. Look round, and see how many of them are still in apparent danger of damnation. And how can you walk, and talk, and be merry with such people, when you know their case? Methinks, when you look them in the face, you should break forth into tears, as the prophet did, when he looked upon Hazael; and then set on them with the most vehement and importunate exhortations. O, for God's sake, and for the sake of poor souls, bestir yourselves, and spare no pains that may conduce to their salvation! What cause have we to blush before the Lord this day, that we have so long neglected this good work! If we had but set upon it sooner, how many more might have been brought to Christ! and how much holier and happier might we have made our societies before now! And why might we not have done it sooner? There were many hinderances: and so there always will be. But the greatest hinderance was in ourselves, in our littleness of faith and love.'

There are other subjects on which I might profitably treat, would our time admit of it; but I pass on to consider the other part of the advice: 'Take heed unto the doctrine.'

The word 'doctrine' is of common occurrence in the Scripture; but though it has some shades of difference in its signification, yet it generally means teaching, or instruction, or the communication of some kind of knowledge. And you must not forget that the ministerial office is an ordinance of instruction; and you are called to be teachers. 'The priest's lips should keep knowledge, and the people should seek the law at his mouth.' 'Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. I will give you pastors according to mine heart, which shall feed you with knowledge and understanding.' The Lord Jesus was a teacher sent from God. He went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues. 'I sat,' saith He, 'daily with you, teaching in the temple:' and He said to His disciples, 'Go and teach all nations;' 'and daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not to teach, and preach Jesus Christ.' Take heed therefore to your teaching.

1. Take heed of the subjects of your teaching.

If all that has been taught by men professing to be the ministers

of Christ were the doctrines of Christ, the charge before us might be deemed unnecessary: but almost as soon as a Christian Church was established upon earth, false doctrines and heretical opinions began to be propagated. Men arose speaking perverse things, to draw away disciples after them: and there were false apostles, and deceitful workers, who corrupted the word of God, or adulterated it with foreign mixtures, to suit the corrupt taste of their hearers; or handled it deceitfully, making it speak sentiments foreign to the truth. Hence, mention is made in the Scriptures of the doctrines of men, the doctrine of Balaam, the doctrine of Jezebel, doctrines of vanities, divers and strange doctrines, and even the doctrine of devils. Nor can it excite any surprise that these doctrines are denominated the 'depths of Satan;' some of the deep designs of the devil to deceive the simple. Had these corrupt opinions and damnable heresies been confined to the primitive ages of the Church, and lived only in the page of history, there would have been less need for circumspection on our part: but error is confined to no clime, nor age, nor station; it has descended with the lapse of years to us; even in our day, the most monstrous absurdities are palmed upon the world; and preach what doctrines you like, however much they may outrage common sense, or subvert our common Christianity, they cannot fail to win attention, inspire credence, and find adherents.

Therefore take heed of your doctrine. Let it be sound, wholesome doctrine, such as will promote the spiritual health of all who embrace it: doctrine according to godliness; such as God has revealed, and such as God sanctions, and renders subservient to the establishment and extension of practical godliness in the world: the doctrine of man's total depravity; that he is far gone from original righteousness, and that in his flesh dwelleth no good thing: the doctrine of man's practical sinfulness; that all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God, and that every imagination of the thoughts of the heart is only evil continually: the doctrine of man's helplessness; that he is without strength, and morally incapable, of himself, of performing any works that are acceptable to God: the doctrine of man's danger; that as a sinner he is condemned already, and the wrath of God abideth on him; and that he is every moment liable to be driven away in his wickedness into the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone. Having set before your hearers their disease, never forget to announce their remedy: their disease entailed by the first Adam, and their remedy provided by the second Adam. 'Preach the kingdom of God, and teach those things which concern the Lord Jesus Christ;' which concern His eternal Godhead and His vicarious sacrifice. Let His atonement be your chief theme. 'God hath set forth His Son to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare His righteousness for the remission of sins that are past;' and that propitiation is infinitely available for the sins of the whole world. Jesus Christ by the grace of God tasted death for every man; and his blood cleanseth us from all sin. It is the blood of God's own Son, who is Himself God blessed for ever; and the blood of His cross, which was shed to reconcile all things unto Himself; and in that blood there is such an infinity of merit, that none need perish; and none can perish, but such as reject the counsel of God against themselves, do despite to the

Spirit of grace, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing. And, in order to encourage your hearers to come to the fountain opened for sin and for uncleanness, and to avail themselves of all the benefits of redemption, never forget in all your ministrations the doctrine of a Divine influence; that God will give His Holy Spirit to them that ask Him; that Christianity is a dispensation of the Spirit; the promise of the gift of the Holy Ghost being given to us, and to our children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Time would fail me to enumerate all the subjects, doctrinal, experimental, and practical, on which it will be your duty to treat: let it suffice to say, that, as Methodist preachers, you have pledged yourselves to preach the doctrines of Methodism; doctrines which our venerated founder preached and published to the world; doctrines which we most conscientiously believe are of Divine origin, and agreeable to the analogy of faith; and doctrines, the preaching of which has, through the agency of the Divine Spirit, been so singularly successful in turning multitudes of men from the power of Satan unto God.

2. Take heed to the principles by which you are actuated in teaching.

Actions are the birth of principles; what is seen in the life is but the developement of what previously existed in the heart; and the moral character of an action will be determined in the sight of God by the principle which produced it. Men judge according to the outward appearance,—they have no other means of judging; and if an action has a specious appearance, if it harmonize with their ideas of propriety, they cannot fail to judge favorably of it; hence men's judgments of each other are at best dubious, and frequently erroneous. But God looketh at the heart; He sees not only the outward appearance, but the inward reality; He understandeth all the imaginations of the thoughts; the springs of action and the secret movements of the mind, are all naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.

We cannot question for a moment but what there are many selfish, sinister, and impious principles and motives, at work in the human mind. Sensuality sways the world, and worldly-minded men are wholly under its dominion. Moved by the cursed lust of gold, the miser 'throws up his interest in both worlds.' For the love of honor, the ambitious man pursues 'the bubble reputation even in the cannon's mouth;' and to gratify the licentious passion for amusement, crowds of pleasure-taking tribes fly to the haunts of dissipation,

> 'And wear about the mockery of wo,
> To midnight revels and the public show.'

And it is to be feared that many have usurped the office of the Christian ministry, under the influence of motives not a whit more justifiable in the sight of God, nor more creditable to themselves, than those which I have mentioned.

> '——— How many pastors, either vain
> By nature, or by flattering made so, taught
> To gaze at their own splendor, and t' exalt
> Absurdly not their office but themselves!'

And how many minister at the altar for a maintenance, and insinuate themselves into the priest's office for a morsel of bread! Therefore take heed to your principles; guard against the influence of selfish motives. If you are really the ministers of Christ, as you profess to be, and as we esteem you, then He has put you into the ministry; and love to Christ, and a sincere, soul-absorbing desire to promote His glory, and extend His knowledge in the world, must be your spring of action. 'The love of Christ,' saith the apostle, 'constraineth us,' bears us away, and carries us forward in the discharge of our high commission. And if you love Christ, you will love the souls He purchased with His blood; you will deem no sacrifices too great, no labors too arduous, to bring back to Christ his long-lost property. For nothing constrains like love; its attractions are irresistible: 'many waters cannot quench love; neither can the floods drown it.' It brings all its offerings, and lays them at the feet of its object; and in the spirit of sacrifice it does all to please that object.

3. Take heed to the manner of your teaching.

Very much of the success of the Gospel depends upon the manner in which it is preached. Many mar the work of their own hands, and prejudice the cause which they desire to promote. Take heed that your teaching be plain and intelligible. Make your hearers to understand your meaning. Do not aim at instructing them by adopting a style and phraseology which they cannot comprehend. The far greater part of your auditory will generally be plain people, people in the humble walks of life, without literature, and perhaps without education: you should aim therefore at a Divine simplicity in communicating instruction. It was quaintly said by one of the ancients, that 'a divine ought to calculate his sermon as an astronomer does his almanac, to the meridian of the place and people where he lives.' St. Paul, in writing to the Corinthians, says, 'We use great plainness of speech.' 'And I, brethren,' says he again, 'when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God; for I determined not to know any thing among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified: and my speech and my preaching was not with the enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.' 'For,' says he, addressing himself to the same people, 'except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken?' Some darken counsel, by uttering words without knowledge; having confused notions themselves, their words convey no determinate meaning, and their hearers understand them not, because they themselves know not what they say, nor whereof they affirm. But while, on the one hand, you guard against metaphysical subtleties, bombastic language, and high-sounding epithets, take heed that you do not, on the other, adopt a coarseness of expression inconsistent with the majesty of evangelical truth; vulgarity is no virtue; and a low colloquial style of preaching often offends, rather than conciliates; and excites prejudice rather than attention. Religious truth should be set forth in its native simplicity and grandeur; and its ministers should learn to discriminate between real beauties and meretricious decorations,—between the ornamental clothing and the tawdry vestment.

Take heed that your teaching be pointed and persuasive. In order

to this, select such texts and subjects for discussion, as have a direct bearing on the present and endless interests of your hearers. Revealed truth is universally important; but it is not all of equal importance. There are superior and subordinate truths in religion: some of these are frequently brought forward, largely discussed, and pointedly insisted on in the Holy Scriptures; others are only incidentally mentioned, and are rather intended as ornaments to decorate the temple of truth than pillars to support it. And there are duties which, like the payment of tithe of mint, anise, and cummin, must not be left undone; but there are others, such as judgment, mercy, and faith, which are called by our Savior, 'weightier matters of the law,' which demand peculiar attention. Therefore bring before your congregations truths, the knowledge and practice of which are essential to their salvation; and do not satisfy yourselves merely with propounding, explaining, or even confirming these truths, but press them upon the acceptance of your hearers; make the most powerful, pointed, and earnest appeals to their consciences. St. Paul, in the synagogue at Ephesus, 'spake boldly for three months, disputing and persuading the things concerning the kingdom of God.' And, writing to the Corinthians, he says, 'Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men.' You, too, must seek to persuade men: persuade them to break off their sins by repentance; to cast away all their abominations; to have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness; to fly with outstretched arms to God their Savior, and to do it without delay. And while you have the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, you can never be at a loss for strong reasons, persuasive arguments, and subjects of forcible appeal to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

Take heed that your teaching be kind and affectionate. The law was a ministration of condemnation and of death; and the Jewish prophets were frequently sent with messages of unmingled wrath, and commissioned to menace the people with God's terrible judgments,—to smite with the hand, and stamp with the foot, and say, 'Alas, for all the evil abominations of the house of Israel!' The Gospel is a ministration of mercy; it is a proclamation of peace, and good will toward men; and therefore you must put on bowels of mercies, and affectionately entreat your hearers to be reconciled to God. Hear what the apostle of the Gentiles said to the Thessalonians: 'We were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; so, being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you, not the Gospel of God only, but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us.' 'Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and justly and unblamably we behaved ourselves among you that believe: as ye know how we exhorted and comforted and charged every one of you, as a father doth his children.'

But while you teach the people kindly and affectionately, take heed to do it faithfully. Do not let your affection degenerate into effeminacy, or pusillanimity. Guard against the indulgence of a mean, time-serving temper; and never imagine that a soft, apish affectation, will pass as a substitute for Christian kindness or ministerial affection. A more affectionate and deeply-interested man than St. Paul the world has seldom seen; for he counted not his life dear unto himself, so that he might fulfil the ministry that he had received of the Lord Jesus: at the

same time, there were combined in him a dignified demeanor, and an inviolable fidelity that rendered him proof against every temptation. With what faithfulness did he address himself to the Corinthians!—'I call God for a record upon my soul, that to spare you I came not as yet unto Corinth.' Do not fail, therefore, to be faithful: faithful to the people, in keeping back nothing that would be profitable unto them; appointing to every man his portion of meat in due season. For 'it is required of stewards that a man be found faithful.'

4. Take heed in your teaching that you keep in mind the great design for which the Gospel ministry is established.

Remember it is not to amuse your hearers with flights of fancy, or flowers of rhetoric. Nor is it merely to call them away from their secular avocations to the services of the sanctuary. Nor is it to make proselytes to mere opinions. But a Gospel ministry is established, first, to enlighten men's minds. Darkness covers the earth, and gross darkness the people; hence they walk in darkness, and dwell in the land of the shadow of death. But 'the entrance of thy word,' saith the psalmist, 'giveth light; it giveth understanding to the simple.' 'I send thee,' said Christ to St. Paul, 'to open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness unto light.' Let your preaching, therefore, be luminous and instructive. The Gospel is a great light,—a light shining in a dark place; and ministers especially are to 'be the lights of the world,' that being illuminated with true knowledge and understanding of God's word, they may, by their preaching and living, set it forth and show it accordingly.

Secondly. A Gospel ministry is established for the purpose of affecting men's hearts. The human heart is naturally hard and unfeeling, and no mortal power can soften or subdue it. For however susceptible it may be of impressions from worldly objects, or however affected by the recital of a tragic story or a plaintive tale, yet toward the things of God and its own eternal interests, it is as cold and callous as a stone. But 'the word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword.' 'Is not my word like as a fire, saith the Lord; and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?' See the effect of Peter's preaching on the day of pentecost, when his hearers were pricked in their hearts, and, from a conviction of their heinous wickedness, in crucifying the Lord of glory, exclaimed, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' Aim therefore at producing similar effects by your preaching. Keep in mind that you are not only to open blind eyes, but to soften hard hearts; not only to illuminate the understanding, but to convict the conscience. And that you may affect others, be affected yourselves. He who speaks from the heart speaks to it:

> 'There is in souls a sympathy with sounds;
> Some chord in unison with what we hear
> Is touch'd within us, and the heart replies.'

Thirdly. A Gospel ministry is established for the purpose of regenerating men's souls. Regeneration is an essential preparative for heaven; for 'except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' And this Divine change is instrumentally effected by the preaching of the Gospel. 'Of His own will,' saith St. James, 'begat He us by the word of truth.' 'I have begotten you,' saith St. Paul,

to the Corinthians, 'through the Gospel.' 'Being born again,' saith St. Peter, 'not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever.' Take heed, therefore, in your teaching, to insist on the absolute necessity of regeneration; that nothing short of a new creation, or an entire renewal of the soul in righteousness, can produce a moral meetness for the enjoyments of heaven; and from a deeply radicated conviction of the utter inefficiency of mere human teaching to effect this highly important change in the soul of man, cry mightily to God that His Gospel, delivered by you, may come not in word only, but in power, and in the Holy Ghost, and in much assurance.

Finally. A Gospel ministry is established for the purpose of building up believers on their most holy faith. 'When Christ ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.' 'And now, brethren,' said St. Paul to the Ephesian elders, 'I commend you to God, and to the word of His grace, which is able to build you up.' And, as ministers, you have much to do, not only in seeking to convert sinners from the error of their ways, but in promoting the instruction and edification of saints. Have they many privileges to enjoy? These must be explained, and urged upon their attention. Are they exposed to many temptations? Against these they must be cautioned, and warned, and guarded. Are they discouraged because of the way? To inspire them with confidence, the promises of grace and the consolations of the Gospel must be plainly and explicitly set before them. And as Apollos 'helped them much which had believed through grace,' so you must labor to urge on believers to seek higher attainments in personal holiness, that they may be filled with all the fulness of God.

And remember it is imperative upon you to take heed to your teaching, no less than to yourselves. You should do it for your own sake. There is a weight of responsibility resting upon you, of which you cannot divest yourselves. Your own salvation, in common with that of your hearers, depends on your personal and ministerial fidelity. The apostle, after having charged Timothy to take heed to himself and the doctrine, adds, 'for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.' You cannot neglect your ministerial duty without endangering your own salvation, and incurring the vengeance of Him who hath said, 'If thou warn not the wicked, but he die in his sins, his blood will I require at thy hands.'

You should do it for the people's sake. While they supply you with carnal things, you are bound to minister to them spiritual things. In a subordinate sense, their interests are placed in your hands, and their destiny for eternity depends, in no inconsiderable degree, upon your conduct. You are over them in the Lord, you watch for their souls, and you may become the instruments of their salvation; for ministers are prophetically denominated 'saviors,' who should 'come upon Mount Zion, to judge the mount of Esau, and the kingdom shall be the Lord's.'

You should do it for God's sake. You are stewards of the mysteries of God. You are not only His offspring, but His professed, con-

secrated and devoted servants. His vows are upon you. He has invested you with talents and qualifications for the work of the ministry; and has committed unto you the word of reconciliation; and gratitude to God for the honor He has put upon you, and fear lest you should incur His displeasure by the non-improvement or abuse of your talents, should excite you to take heed to your teaching.

And you are bound to take heed to your doctrine for the sake of posterity. One generation passeth away, and another cometh; and the habits, manners, and characters of the generation that cometh will be formed by the generation that passeth away. And it is for you to give the tone to the next generation of Methodists, both of ministers and people: we commit to you this day a most sacred trust: you are the rising hope of that great body to which you are now most intimately, and, I trust, inviolably united. It remains with you to make known to the people of your charge the unadulterated doctrines of truth; that the generation to come may know them, even the children which shall be born, who shall arise and declare them to their children; and thus religion shall descend like an hereditary patrimony from age to age. The fathers of our Israel are gone! gone the way whence they shall not return; they have fulfilled their course, and have fallen asleep: a few only remain lingering in the vale of tears, who were personally acquainted with the founder of Methodism; and soon all who had any knowledge of that venerable man will be no more seen. But though the laborers are called to their reward, yet the fruit of their labor remains. Methodism in all the purity of its doctrine, and in the wholesomeness of its discipline, still lives in the affections of thousands: in the early period of its existence it was 'rocked by the winds and cradled in the storm;' but though the peal of slander against it has been rung in the ears of the populace for more than half a century, yet it has held on its course, and waxed stronger and stronger; and while its children walk by the same rule, and mind the same thing, it will obtain a still firmer hold on the minds of the world's population, and find friends and advocates among generations yet unborn.

And now, brethren, I commend you to God. Go to your several spheres of action in His name; labor on at his command; and for His sake sow beside all waters. Never forget that all your springs are in Him, and all your sufficiency is derived from Him. Depend entirely upon Him for success: and believe that He who has employed you will not suffer you to labor in vain, or spend your strength for nought. And though difficulties may await you, and stones of stumbling and rocks of offence lie in your path; though you may not have *all* the encouragement you desire, nor *all* the success you anticipate; yet, if Israel be not gathered, you shall be glorious in the eyes of the LORD; and when the chief Shepherd shall appear, you shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away.

For the Methodist Magazine, and Quarterly Review.

BISHOP M'ILVAINE'S CHARGE TO THE CLERGY.

A Charge to the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Ohio, on the Preaching of Christ Crucified; delivered before the Seventeenth Annual Convention of the Diocess at Chillicothe, Sept. 5th, 1834, *by* CHARLES P. M'ILVAINE, D. D., *bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of Ohio.*

WE cannot easily express the pleasure with which we perused this production of Bishop M'Ilvaine. From the importance of the subject indicated by the title and the high reputation for piety and talent which the author enjoys, we expected much, and we are happy that our expectations have been fully realized. Several considerations have induced us to think that we should perform an acceptable service in spreading the outlines of this excellent Charge before the readers of the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

1. We should cherish a grateful remembrance of our obligations to that Church from one of whose dignitaries it proceeds. It was in her bosom that our own Wesley was trained up. He was born within her pale, baptized into her faith, reared by her hand, educated at her academies, grounded in her sentiments, imbued with the principles of her homilies, and animated by the spirit of her martyrs. If the Church of England had no other claims to the gratitude of the world, this is sufficient to lay us under eternal obligation, that she gave birth to a man who was the instrument in the Divine hand of the most glorious revival of religion the world ever saw, since the days of the apostles—a revival which, bursting forth from Oxford, has spread into the four quarters of the globe, and, we think, is destined to spread more and more until it shall usher in the splendors of the millennial day.

2. It will be gratifying, we doubt not, to the friends of our own Zion to see what is doing in other sections of the vineyard. The Christian cause is essentially one cause, as the spiritual Church is vitally one body. 'We are every one members one of another.' 'If one member suffer all the members suffer with it, or if one member be honored all the members rejoice with it.' It is for narrow-hearted bigotry to look with jealousy upon the advancement which any sister denomination is making in the true interests of Christianity. But holy love, the true spirit of Jesus Christ, only asks, 'Is Christ preached?' and in the affirmative it ever rejoices, 'yea, and will rejoice.' Now this is our rejoicing in the present case. We find Christ preached not only in name but in fact, and in a way that we think calculated to diffuse a most salutary influence throughout the diocess of Ohio. We congratulate that portion of the Church on the possession of a diocesan who we believe will conscientiously use his authority and influence in the propagation of soundly evangelical principles.

3. The subject of this Charge is one of pre-eminent importance, and delivered in a day when it is imperatively necessary that 'the trumpet should give no uncertain sound.' The great confliction of religious opinion which has been agitating the world for the last few years, has struck out some singular forms of error, and presented them to the public in a manner peculiarly calculated to militate against 'the truth

as it is in Jesus.' From the various antiquated species of heterodoxy, the Church seems to be, at present, in little danger. They are too well understood to make any great advances among us, at least in their old forms. Christianity cannot now be divested of all appearance of spirituality and practical influence, and retain the respect of even the irreligious. The great enemy of mankind has therefore fallen upon new expedients. Great appearances of zeal, and self denial, and the assertion of high views of spiritual and practical piety, are blended with most dangerous defects in doctrine. In some cases the doctrine of self conversion is taught; in others altogether nugatory evidences of conversion are held forth and insisted on; and these are followed by the insidious doctrine of the impossibility of falling from grace—the impossibility of forfeiting a conversion which itself is no conversion! Powerful inducement to rest in a state of nature, alienated from Christ, and 'without God in the world!' But that which strikes us as the most alarming feature of our times is the neglect of Christ in the pulpits. It is no uncommon thing to hear whole sermons in which the Savior is not mentioned. He seems to be utterly divorced from His own system. We seem to have a religion without a Savior; a sacred altar, but no officiating High Priest; a holy and awful Deity, but no atonement or Mediator. And when the awakened sinner feels the claims of the Divine law, and trembles at the view of infinite justice and purity, there is nothing placed upon which hope may rest—nothing between him and absolute despair. Or it may be, that in the agony of his mind he is told to trust in the mercy of God and he will be forgiven; and every argument that is used is drawn from reason and nature, to prove that 'God is love,' and scarcely any thing is said, perhaps nothing but a mere transient allusion, to show the only true ground of a sinner's hope, and the only decided proof of God's mercy to fallen and guilty man, the gift of His Son for our redemption. The poor condemned sinner may be amused by some cunning theory or some rhapsodical expressions, in which there is no satisfactory exhibition of Christ as the Savior, until his agitation subsides, and his convictions in a great measure pass away. Then his conscience is lulled with false views, and he settles down in a belief of his own piety, when he has never found 'redemption through the blood of Christ, even the forgiveness of his sins.' Or it may be that his sympathies, having been powerfully excited, his stimulated imagination is suddenly struck by some vivid or impassioned expressions, and he is thrown for a moment into a transport of emotion. He possibly calls it conversion, and yet he can afterward give no satisfactory evidence that his hope is based on Jesus Christ. Different classes of persons will exhibit different modifications of error, as they are characterized by variety in mental habits or constitution. Those whose characters are marked by an exuberance of feeling will fall into the latter error. Those whose reason and judgment preponderate, will fall into the former. But into which of the two they fall it matters but little; they are both equally anti-christian and destructive. As we do not believe in a religion that has no Savior, neither do we believe in that conversion that does not recognize Christ in His atoning and redeeming character, 'for there is no other name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved.' And that preaching, whose tendency

is not to place Christ as the only ground of a sinner's hope, and then to keep Him in view as the only trust of the believer, begins with laying 'another foundation than that which is laid' in the Gospel, and finishes by daubing the unsound edifice with untempered mortar. Thus its commencement is in error, and its termination in destruction.

But it is time to take up the Charge, which has called forth our reflections. We find here a remedy for these defects. It is a Scriptural view of the duty of preaching 'Christ and Him crucified.' To do justice perhaps to the intellect displayed in this production, we might be induced to quote other passages than those we shall select. But our business is chiefly with the sentiments, and our estimate of their importance must determine our quotations. After having set forth the design of this address, and adverted to the variety of topics in the apostles' ministry, as well as the diversity of their talent, and the various characters of their hearers, the author observes,—

'—there was one subject in which all hearers were taught to behold the beginning and the ending of religion, the whole consolation of a sinful world—the whole business, strength, and glory of a Christian minister. They made it their invariable principle to know nothing, to glory in nothing among men but 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified,' so that 'every where, in the temple and in every house, they ceased not to teach and to preach Jesus Christ.' To set forth the glories of His person and of His work—to teach Him in His various offices and benefits, in His humiliation and death—in His resurrection and exaltation—in His freeness of grace to receive and His fulness of grace to save the chief of sinners; to persuade men to flee to Him as their refuge, to follow Him as their King, to rejoice in Him always as their everlasting portion, and always, and by all means, to glorify Him as Head over all things for His people; this was their life's business unto which they had so separated themselves as to be virtually dead to whatever might hinder its promotion.'

After having observed that without this 'preaching of Christ,' all learning and wisdom and eloquence will be in vain, as it respects the salvation of souls, and that consequently all our prayers and talents should be concentrated upon this object, our author proposes in the prosecution of the subject two purposes. The first is to show how near a minister may come to the appropriate design of his calling, and yet fall short of it. The second, what it is really to 'preach Christ crucified.' Under the former of these heads we find some very judicious and important observations. For instance,—

'It is possible to preach a great deal of important truth having an essential relation to the Gospel,—truth unmingled with any erroneous statement or principle. * * It may speak often of Christ and pathetically describe His agony and death,' and yet 'be so meagre and confused, so general and feeble as to all those vital doctrines which lead to Him, and spring from Him, and depend on Him, which lay the foundation and bind together the whole structure of Christian faith, as to be wholly unworthy the name of preaching Christ. * * * * How often is the preaching *about* Christ confounded with preaching *Christ*—preaching from the imagination with preaching from the heart. The minister may thus deceive himself, and the great majority of his people may

be thus deceived; while some obscure, unlettered disciple, whose draughts of truth have been taken undiluted from the wells of salvation, will be sensible of some painful deficiency; and the anxious inquirer, thirsting for the Gospel, will listen and wait in vain to be taught what he must do to be saved. * * * * It is one thing to prove that there is no salvation but in Christ, and quite another to teach a soul, panting for mercy, how he is to win Christ and be found in Him.'

Let these remarks stand as a reproof against all such preaching as leaves the Savior out of view. For if thus to preach Him fall short of the true character of Gospel sermons, what shall we say of those who preach as if there was no Savior. Many are the discourses which would draw forth the melancholy exclamation of a pious man after listening to such defective preaching—'Alas! they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid Him.' I remember myself a pious and simple-hearted Christian who dare never approach the mercy seat himself, without distinctly recognizing and acknowledging in his own heart the ground of his access, after hearing a prayer of this nature, observe: 'I had to keep saying to myself, for Christ's sake—for Christ's sake—or I could not have got along with it at all.' We have frequently heard prayers as well as sermons in which nothing could be discovered to identify them as evangelical or Christian, except perhaps winding up with the Savior's name, and from the negligent manner it might be doubted whether even this was done from any heartfelt purpose, or from mere habit, or gracefully to round off the period. Now it is a question which is worthy of serious consideration, How far can that person be deeply conscious of his obligations to Christ, of his dependence on the atonement;—how far can he be aware of the only ground and term of our acceptance with God and access to the throne of grace, who does not purposely, feelingly, and constantly urge this plea at every approach to the mercy seat?* It is not in our view sufficient that the sentiment itself be in the person's creed. The question is, How far is it a living, operating principle in the heart? If we are justified and saved only through Christ, if our prayers are to be offered in His name, and if answers are to be expected for His sake alone, how far are we to expect to be heard, or answered, or saved, if there be not a constant feeling of our dependence on Christ, and such a feeling too as fills the heart and forces the lips to give it utterance? If from the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh, it seems to us the heart cannot be very full of the love of Christ our Savior, nor deeply sensible of its dependence on Him that does not in prayer make mention of His name, indispensable as it is, to our obtaining an audience with Deity. Yet we would not set up any arbitrary standards of judgment, nor decide uncharitably in doubtful cases. We submit it as a question for consideration, and hope it will not be passed lightly over.

*We hope we shall not be understood to signify that the name of the Savior must be repeated at the end of every sentence. This would become painful, if not profane. We mean that in every prayer there must be express mention of the ground on which we come into the Divine presence. It ought to be made near the commencement, and repeated or alluded to in the progress, just as a heart humbly depending on Jesus Christ alone would naturally prompt, but always with 'the spirit and the understanding also,'—with reverence and sincerity.

There is another feature in the above extract not less important. We mean the distinction between preaching from the imagination and preaching from the heart. We are endowed by our Creator with various faculties, and each faculty has its appropriate functions. It is moreover a law of our nature that each faculty responds to its kindred faculty. Mind affects mind, reason excites reason, imagination kindles imagination, and heart moves heart. Now as it is impossible for physical power to control the intellectual movements, so also it is impossible for imagination to move the heart, or the pure emotions of the heart to stimulate to any great extent the imagination. We do not deny that there is a sympathy between all our faculties, and that stirring one part will spread the undulations over the entire surface. Yet the chief commotion will be at the first point of action. From thence the influence spreads out farther and farther until it dies away in its distance from the part whose tranquillity was first disturbed. Any person may have proof of what we say by observing the effects produced on his mind by the perusal of any author. He will not find his imagination stimulated by reading Locke on the Understanding, or Butler's Analogy; nor his reason and judgment improved by novelists and dramatists: nor his heart and conscience awakened by Blair's Sermons, nor his devotional feelings enkindled by Moore's Sacred Melodies, beautiful as they are. But this is the very reason they do not affect us; they strike us as the work of the imagination, and there is about them too much evidence of effort. His figures glitter and sparkle like the moon beams among icicles, but there is no heat in them. On the contrary, read the hymns of the Wesleys, and though the illustrations are often admirable and poetic in the highest degree, yet they are evidently the breathings of the heart; and therefore they reach the heart.* Hence some splendid sermons produce no moral effect. The effort is too apparent. There is more pains bestowed upon the language and imagery than upon the thoughts or tendency.

* Those who are too fond of embellishing their sermons, who study the language more than the thoughts, and manner more than matter, would do well to consult more carefully the principles of sound criticism. In Kames' Elements we find the following judicious remarks, chap. xviii, sect. 2. 'The language ought to correspond to the subject. Heroic actions or sentiments require elevated language; tender sentiments ought to be expressed in words soft and flowing; and plain language void of ornament is adapted to subjects grave and didactic.—Language may be considered as the dress of thought; and where the one is not suited to the other we are sensible of incongruity, in the same manner as where a judge is dressed like a fop, or a peasant like a man of quality.' Again chap. x, 'A serious and important subject admits not much ornament; nor a subject that of itself is extremely beautiful; and a subject that fills the mind with its loftiness and grandeur appears best in a dress altogether plain.' It may be laid down as a good general rule, that whenever, excepting in poetry and works professedly of imagination, the mind is more struck with the words than with the thought, there is a deviation from nature and from sound judgment. The auxiliary then takes place of the principal. For this reason those, generally speaking, are the most indifferent preachers who call forth the observations—What a flow of language! What charming figures! Such preachers generally entertain their hearers with pretty words and sparkling images, instead of feeding them with knowledge and understanding. It is like setting a hungry man down to a dish of syllabub; it may perhaps gratify his palate, but it yields no nourishment.

'Like quicksilver, their rhetoric they display,
Shines as it runs, but grasp'd at, slips away.'

Observe, this does not affect the *amount* of preparation in a sermon, but the *kind*. The spirit in which a sermon is studied, and the object the preacher has in view, will generally be apparent, and the effect produced will be in accordance. The more a sermon is studied the better, provided it be in the right way. Of Mr. Wesley it is said, when he studied he succeeded; if otherwise, he failed. Few studied their sermons more than the celebrated Massillon, and yet he produced great effect. The observation of Louis the Fourteenth after hearing him preach at Versailles is familiar to all—'Father, I have heard many fine orators in my chapel, and have been very much pleased with them; but as for you, always when I have heard you, I have been very much displeased with myself.' Others prepared their sermons with the *head* only, Massillon prepared his with the *heart*.

The same distinction accounts for the fact which at first view appears not a little perplexing. Many preachers who are most successful in producing emotions, are not always most successful in producing convictions. We have sometimes seen a congregation wrought up into a high state of excitement by strong efforts of eloquence or by graphic descriptions, and when the commotion has subsided, no sound awakenings, and little spiritual edification have followed. And we have also seen the sound, but plain, logical, and didactic preacher produce strong and permanent impression, that has resulted in the awakening of the guilty and the solid benefit of the pious. How is it to be explained? The eloquence of the one, vivid and impassioned as it was, came only from the imagination; the reasoning of the other came from a heart set earnestly upon the accomplishment of an object, which it pursues according to the natural bent of the mind. Hence the one fires the imagination and enkindles a sort of sensibility, the other reaches the heart, and moulds the consciences and principles and purposes of his auditory. Thus, whether the sermon be logical or imaginative, cool or impassioned, didactic or hortatory, doctrinal or practical, still it must come from the heart in order to reach the heart. It is not so much the intellectual character of a discourse that determines the point. This will be according to the natural habit of the preacher's mind. The abbé Maury in his Treatise on Pulpit Eloquence justly observes, 'that to arrive at the sublime,' (and true sublimity in a discourse is that point which effects the design of the orator,) 'it is, in fact, less necessary to elevate his imagination than to be deeply impressed with his subject.' It is a well-known adage, 'If you wish me to weep, it is first necessary that you weep yourself.' Or in other words, if you make another feel the importance of a subject, it is first necessary that you feel it.

But there may be another reason why some very feeling preachers do not produce more spiritual effect: a want of bringing the Savior into view at the right juncture or in the right way. We may dwell, for instance, upon His sufferings, and yet do it in such a manner as not to leave any distinct impression on the hearer that he is particularly interested in them. We may treat on the beauty of piety, and yet not show how it is obtained through Jesus Christ. We may depict from imagination the joys of heaven, and still embody no essential Gospel principles. A preacher who has very quick sensibilities, a pathetic

voice, a lively imagination, and energy in delivery, may play finely upon the feelings of his auditory: every chord he touches may vibrate, and the sighs and even groans of his hearers may 'discourse sweet music in his ears,' and yet I will venture to say that unless he bring Christ into view and exhibit his relation to the whole, little spiritual effect will ensue. God will not honor a ministry that does not 'honor the Son even as it honors the Father.' But how great the pity that such powers should be lost. For it is a blessed and holy art to rouse the sensibilities of a whole congregation; to stir the very depths of the soul, and bring all its feelings into play. And then to turn the full current of the excited emotions upon the cross; to set Christ fully before the people, saying to the Christian, Behold the seal of your mercies, the centre of your hopes: and to the sinner, 'Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world,' and so to press home the subject that one cries out, 'My Lord and my God,' and the other exclaims, 'O! that I knew where I might find Him;'—this indeed is an art beyond all others, and to acquire it, heart, soul, intellect, should be ever on the stretch.

But to return to the Charge—we find some very useful and important hints in the next paragraph, on preaching the law, without showing the relation which Christ sustains to it, and placing the sinner in a state of hopeless condemnation without exhibiting the Savior as a refuge, and faith in Him as the medium of his reconciliation to God. Such preaching exhibits duty, but it does not bring into view the only means of performing duty, the influences of the Spirit received by faith in the Son of God. The law then instead of being our 'schoolmaster to bring us to Christ,' is only a law of condemnation or a mere system of morality.

We commend also to the attention of our readers the following passage from page 8:—

'A minister, in addition to the features already described, may make a great use in almost every discourse of the name of the Redeemer, and occasionally His person or office may be presented with some appropriate prominence, and taught with unexceptionable distinctness; and yet it may be only when the text, according to plain rhetorical propriety, demands this treatment that Christ is thus set forth; and the minister may not very frequently select such texts as would thus constrain him. Passing from one subject to another, their succession may bring him in course to something involving of necessity a concentrated attention to the Savior, in some of the great bearings of his work; and then he may be sufficiently explicit and correct; while the spiritually minded hearer, attending upon the whole train of his preaching, will look in vain for such a graceful bending of every discourse toward "the Author and Finisher of our faith;" such a skilful interweaving of all other legitimate topics with those cardinal truths that centre in the cross, as will show at once, however remote the subject from the centre of the Gospel system, that it obeys the attraction and shines in the light of Christ. There is no such habitual passing to and fro between the ruin of man by sin, and his remedy by the Savior; between the covenant written on stone and working death, and the covenant of grace, written on the heart and working life, as that whatever the preacher teaches shall have left on

it the sign of the cross, and the whole tenor of his work shall proclaim that *for him to preach is Christ.*'

Having thus disposed of the negative part, and shown clearly what is not preaching Christ, our author now proceeds to show more directly what is. On this part of the subject we find the following spirited and judicious remarks:—

'The Gospel is a *system* of truth and duty; its parts are all harmonious and mutually relevant and dependent. It has a centre, luminous, glorious, all-controlling, to which all the parts around refer for the light in which they are revealed, and the harmony of their every bearing. You can neither illustrate this system till you have shown its central power and light, nor fully describe its centre without exhibiting the various relations and dependencies of its surrounding system. The centre is Christ. All lines meet in Him—all light and life come from Him—all truth is dark till He is risen upon the scene. Lesser lights are only to rule the night. It is for the sun to rule the day.

'Now what is the best mode of exhibiting this wonderful arrangement of grace, so that he who runs may read? Where will you begin? At the outskirts of the system, taking up first its remoter elements, and reasoning on from one relation to another, till you get to Christ? To do this clearly, you must give it the time of many discourses. In some circumstances and after a more direct method has been well employed, it may be well. But supposing a people ignorant in a great measure of the first principles of the Gospel, how can you keep them waiting so long in the dark? They have come to see the King—and however important may seem to you their tardy introduction, every thing seems to them impertinent, till they have been admitted to His presence. You find your hearer as a benighted traveller, afraid to continue his way, lest there be a precipice at his feet. You may present him with a chart of his road, but how will it help him as long as he cannot see? He waits the sunrise. One ray from the sun will serve him better than a thousand maps to be read in the dark. Then, but not till then, will a chart of the country be important.

'Astronomers, in teaching the doctrine of the solar system, begin with the sun. They proceed directly to tell what it is, and what it does. This is the first thing to be understood. Nothing in the science can be explained, till this is explained. Let the teacher of the Gospel system imitate the example. So I perceive the apostles began. In their preaching, I behold no gradual ceremonious approach from a great distance, like the parallels of a siege, to the one object of their ministry. There was one personage whom it was the immediate business of their apostleship to introduce to sinners—"*Jesus of Nazareth, the only-begotten Son of God, full of grace and truth.*" There was one capital event in His history, which it was their immediate business to make known to every creature—*Jesus crucified as a propitiation for the sin of the whole world.* To these, their ministry immediately leaped. Here they always broke ground first and set up their tower of attack. Just at the point, where their enemies, in malignant triumph, supposed the Gospel had died, with the cross of its entombed founder for its only memorial, his disciples, in the triumph of faith, and lifting up that cross for a banner, made their beginning. Just that which laid

the stumbling block to the Jew and seemed such foolishness to the Greek, they adopted as the head and front of their preaching; advancing boldly upon both Jew and Greek, like David with his single stone against the contemptuous giant of Gath; glorying in nothing, determined to use nothing, "save Jesus Christ and Him crucified." Thus saith St. Paul: "I deliver unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures." As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, did they at once lift up Christ on the cross, as an ensign to the people. They could not spare time to be rooting out prejudices, and gradually preparing the minds of the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles for the great subject of Christ's atonement. They knew no way of removing darkness so sure as that of introducing the sun; no way of subduing the enmity of the heart to the Gospel so short as that of making men acquainted with the very essence of the Gospel. Human device would have said to St. Paul, "Make use of your philosophy for an introduction to your theology—call science to your aid—show the fitness of things—impress your audience with a respectful idea of your attainments in the wisdom of the schools; aim at the nerve of Demosthenes—put on the golden robes of Cicero—speak of your Master in His manhood, in His miracles, benevolence, and piety; compare His precepts with those of heathen sages; but cast a veil over His ignominious death, and the humiliating plan of salvation through faith in His suffering, till the public mind shall be somewhat inured to the less offensive features of His religion." "No," said St. Paul, "lest the cross of Christ should be made of none effect." There was a declaration of the Master which an apostle could not misunderstand: "*I, if I be lifted up, will draw all men unto me.*" In this they read the secret of their success. Lifted up on the cross by His enemies, He had been already. Lifted up in the sight of all people, He was now to be by the ministry of the word. Their principle was, "God giveth the increase," and "hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise, and the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty," "that no flesh—(that neither preacher nor convert) should glory in His presence," but that all may feel that it is "Christ Jesus who, of God, is made unto them wisdom and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." '

Thus our author having brought Christ into view, insists eloquently upon the exhibition of His offices and character in all their richness and variety, with all distinctness and constancy. 'The Sun,' he says, 'is risen; now see that it remains unclouded, always in full view from the remotest circle of your hearers, so that the weakest and lowest eye may see. Now you must keep up attention to this superior object by telling your people all that the Scriptures tell you about Christ. Your business is that they "*may know Christ and be found in Him.*" ' In order to this, he insists on the necessity of setting Him forth in His mediation and atonement; as our Prophet, Priest, and King, in His death, resurrection, ascension, and intercession—as the 'Head over all things to His Church,' and to declare not only the love, but 'the wrath of the Lamb.' But we cannot follow at length these remarks, excellent as they are. We pass on to others.

Bishop M'Ilvaine does not lose sight of the fact that there are many important doctrines more or less remotely connected with the one great

theme, which require the preacher's faithful exhibition. But all these are to be so held forth as still to point to the leading object. Do we for instance preach on the Divine character? Let it be so as to show that the sinner cannot stand accepted with such a Being without a Mediator. Do we preach on the fall? Let us still remind our hearers of the great Deliverer. Do we treat on the resurrection of the dead? Let us bring into view 'the first fruits of them that slept,' and our resurrection secured by His, and His resurrection as sealing the truth of Christianity and ensuring the salvation of all them that believe in and obey Him. Do we warn sinners to turn to God, and urge the pious to perseverance in duty? Let us beseech them for Christ's sake, drawing our arguments and motives and encouragements from Him. Thus of every other. For we have not learned the art of preaching Christ, until we can show His connection with every part of the Gospel system, and reduce all to practical purposes.

On preaching the law, we find some remarks bearing a strong resemblance to Mr. Wesley's on preaching Christ, and which the reader if he is inclined may see in his works, vol. vi, pp. 555–559; and in his sermon on 'The law established through faith,' in which he insists on preaching the law in all its parts, in order to lead the sinner to see and feel his need of a Savior, and take refuge in the atoning blood. We must make this distinction however: Mr. Wesley was opposing one extreme, Bishop M'Ilvaine the opposite. Making allowance for this, their views are identical.

The Charge also sets forth the necessity of 'exhibiting the Holy Ghost, and its agency, in spiritual regeneration, the sanctifier and comforter; the author and preserver of spiritual life; by whom alone we are born again and daily renewed in the spirit of our minds—the spirit of all prayer, wisdom, and holiness; without whom we are as little able to *will* as *to do* of God's good pleasure.' If however we have any fault to find, it is here. We should like to have seen the witness of the Spirit more fully insisted on. It is also necessary to illustrate with great clearness, that personal act of appropriating faith, by which the law-condemned and conscience-stricken sinner lays hold of the merits of Jesus Christ, reposes with confidence on the efficacy of the atonement, and feels its virtue in the forgiveness of his sins, and regeneration of his heart. But as the discourse is otherwise so clear in exhibiting the method of salvation, we would believe that this omission was rather accidental than from design. Indeed it is unreasonable to expect every thing in one discourse.

There is another passage we cannot deny ourselves the satisfaction of placing before our readers:—

'Before leaving this all-important subject, it is well to give a brief attention to the inquiry, *To what extent we are bound to introduce the way of salvation through Christ into every discourse?* Some would answer that no sermon is truly evangelical, unless it contain a plain exhibition of what a sinner must do to be saved. But were it our duty so to order our ministry that, in every sermon, the way of salvation should be introduced; not by force, but naturally, and by legitimate connection with the main subject; not merely in a few sentences, too general to be understood by the ignorant, and too common-place to arrest the attention of any, but in a manner adapted to enlighten the

mind and affect the heart; then the preacher would be always confined to one neighborhood of subjects, and numerous subordinate ones that are "profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness," must be almost excluded or receive at best a very limited, occasional, and unsatisfactory consideration. Such is not the lesson obtained from the Scriptures. Christ is continually exhibited in the Old Testament annals. They contain the history of His Church as waiting and looking for His appearing. Christ is preached in the whole system of the Mosaic institutions, which were but a shadow of the good things to be found in Him. The tabernacle, with its ark and mercy seat; its altars and furniture; its offerings and daily service—the priesthood, the pillar of cloud, the manna, the rock and the cities of refuge—all speak of Christ. "To Him give all the prophets witness." "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." How entirely every page of the New Testament is pervaded with the same, I need not say. But we do not see, in the New Testament or in the Old, such a confinement to the vicinity of the cross, that no distinct subject is relinquished, till it has led to some distinct exhibition of the way of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ. Every thing has a bearing that way, but does not fall directly into that line. Its course is bent, like the orbit of a planet, by the attraction of that centre; so that though it may never be turned directly, it is always inclined toward the latter, and rendering continual homage to its supremacy. The inspired writers with one common centre, occupied a range of great extent and variety, while at every point they could receive light from the cross, and say, "Behold the Lamb of God."'

This Charge furnishes an excellent illustration of the section in our Discipline, on the preaching of Christ:—

'*Quest.* 1. What is the best general method of preaching?

'*Answ.* 1. To convince: 2. To offer Christ: 3. To invite: 4. To build up: and to do this in some measure in every sermon.

'*Quest.* 2. What is the most effectual way of preaching Christ?

'*Answ.* The most effectual way of preaching Christ, is to preach Him in all His offices; and to declare His law, as well as His Gospel, both to believers and unbelievers. Let us strongly and closely insist upon inward and outward holiness in all its branches.'

The concluding paragraph contains some remarks on a subject which we think seriously demands the attention of the Christian Church. We are not aware that they are particularly appropriate to our own denomination; nor do we believe that the author had us in his mind in making them. Yet it is possible that some individuals among us may be culpable. Indeed there is liability to error in this way wherever the necessity of religious emotion is felt and inculcated. But the error should be guarded against. It consists in human efforts to produce excitement; the adoption of trick and stratagem purely to create feeling. By various little nameless buffooneries and mountebank manoeuvres the imaginations and sympathies of a congregation, at least of the ignorant and undiscerning part, may be wrought up to a high pitch, and tumult and distraction follow. The result is that the intelligent are disgusted and the ignorant deluded. Christianity acknowledges none of this factitious aid. It approaches us only with

holy, Gospel means, and these are eminently simple and efficient. With the law to convince of sin, and awaken the conscience; with a Savior to procure pardon and peace; and with a Holy Spirit to renew and seal the heart; it asks nothing of man but a clear, faithful, powerful exhibition of its truths, and then the combined influence of united, agonizing, believing prayer. The more of these the better. But it wants no human and unauthorized contrivances. It does its work better without them. If they had been needful, we should have been told so in the Book. But there we find nothing of it. It was by 'the foolishness of preaching,' the apostles expected to save souls; and then they exhorted the disciples to 'pray always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly to make known the mystery of the Gospel.' Such was the model of our own Wesley. Powerful excitement, it is true, attended his ministry, but it was always produced by authorized means—'the word of God and prayer.' There was no spiritual jugglery about him. No man was more opposed than he to the adoption of unauthorized and unscriptural expedients. He knew well the difference between the religion of the imagination* and that of the heart, and was well aware that human inventions may create the one but never can produce the other—may 'compass us about with sparks of our own kindling,' but cannot kindle the true fire of the sanctuary. In fact every means to produce fictitious excitement militates against genuine emotion just as a counterfeit injures a reality. He that mistakes the excitement of the imagination for the religion of the heart, is apt to be satisfied with a spurious substitute instead of seeking the soul-saving power. The author of the Natural History of Enthusiasm has some good thoughts upon this subject—'The religion of the heart may be supplanted by a religion of the imagination, just in the same way that the social affections are often dislodged by factitious sensibilities. Every one knows that an artificial excitement of all the kind and tender emotions of our nature may take place through the medium of the imagination. Hence the power of poetry and the drama. But every one must also know that these feelings, however vivid, and seemingly pure and salutary they may be, and however nearly they may resemble the genuine workings of the soul, are so far from producing the same softening effect upon the character, that they tend rather to indurate the heart. * * * * * A process of perversion and of induration precisely similar may have place also among the religious emotions: for the laws of human nature are uniform, whatever may be the immediate cause which puts them in action; and a fictitious piety corrupts or petrifies the heart not less certainly than does a romantic sentimentality.'

But we are detaining our readers too long from the more immediate subject of our remarks.

'Let us strive, my brethren,' says the bishop, 'after a great increase of faith, in the preaching of Christ crucified. Let us make no division of confidence between this Divine ordinance and others of human "art and man's device." There be some who seem to hope

* See his letters to Geo. Bell, and his sermon on 'Knowing Christ after the flesh.'

for but little effect from the plain, faithful preaching of the cross, except in proportion as it is mixed up with certain artificial expedients of arresting attention and exciting emotion. There is an appetite for excitement and novelty in the mode of awakening and converting sinners, which seems to be rapidly increasing in some quarters of the Church of Christ, as well in an insatiate thirst for more potent stimulants, as in the number of its subjects. It is lamentably discarding the simplicity of the Gospel, and substituting a kind of preaching, which, with a special pretence of faithfulness and much redundancy and painful irreverence in the use of Divine names, is sadly wanting in Divine things and spirit; laying almost exclusive stress upon a few disjointed members of Gospel truth, and producing most deformed examples of Gospel efficacy. There is something too tame and sober in the old paths of inspired preachers, for the taste of some in these days. *To teach* as well as *preach*—to go the round of Christian truth, instead of being confined to one or two of its more striking parts, has become the "strange work" of many. To excite the sensibilities by swollen representations, rather than to enlighten the conscience by sober and practical exposition of Scripture; to produce effect by drawing lines of visible separation among the people, by bringing the incipient anxieties of the heart into dangerous and unbecoming publicity, and by the hurrying forward of those whose minds are yet unsettled and unexamined, to an open profession of religion and perhaps a forward lead in devotional exercises, has become the mournful characteristic of much of the ministry that is called evangelical. It may boast many converts; but time will show that it boasts "the lame, the halt, and the blind." It is but another road, though a very short one, to all formality, coldness, and spiritual death. There is such a thing as a zealous formality—a stimulated coldness—an excited corpse. Be such reliances, as I have described, far from you, my brethren! Be jealous of any measure that would divide your faith in the efficacy of the simple preaching of Christ crucified, accompanied "with all prayer and supplication in the spirit." Seek your *power*, directly, entirely, in the influences of the Holy Ghost to awaken, convince, convert, and sanctify the sinner. Behold your *means* in whatever will contribute to the teaching and preaching of Jesus Christ. Use such means with importunate waiting upon God for his blessing, and your ministry "shall be like a tree planted by the rivers of water, that bringeth forth his fruit in his season; whose leaf also shall not wither, and whatsoever it doeth shall prosper." While continually laboring under the practical conviction that God only "giveth the increase;" endeavor so to believe in his promises, as to feel the animating assurance, that God will give increase to the diligent application of that which He has chosen for His chief instrument in the conversion of sinners. Have faith in God! Preach as believing not only in the unspeakable importance of the truth you deliver, but also in the power and faithfulness of your Master to make it mighty to the casting down of whatever opposes the Gospel in the hearts of your people. There is power in faith to remove mountains! One of the first steps toward the promotion of your greater usefulness, is the prayer of the apostle: "*Lord, increase our faith.*" May the Lord in his great love wherewith he loveth us, be pleased to pour out upon you

a spirit of grace and supplication, that, your faith being strengthened and your zeal quickened to all diligence and faithfulness, many may be added unto the Lord under your ministry, and "adorn the doctrine of God our Savior in all things." '

We now take leave of Bishop M'Ilvaine, bidding him God speed in his sacred calling and praying that the sentiments of the Episcopal Charge may be echoed 'in demonstration of the Spirit and of power' from every pulpit in the diocess of Ohio. If the venerated Wesley were now alive would he not rejoice to see the Church he loved coming back to the spirit of her own articles, homilies, and liturgy? He would see the spirit of her Hookers and Pearsons, her Leightons and Bevridges, her Barrows and Burkitts, so long lain in abeyance, breaking forth again in the nineteenth century, and a Richmond, a Cunningham, a Wilson, and others in England, joined by many kindred spirits in America, all 'standing in the way' and 'asking for the old paths' and teaching 'the good way' wherein men should walk to 'find rest for their souls.' Had this been the spirit of the English Church in Mr. Wesley's day, they never would have driven him out into the highways and hedges, and literally compelled him to form a distinct denomination to perpetuate the good he did. Yet who among us does not rejoice in this fact? He was secretly led on by HIM who makes 'the wrath of man to praise Him.' Had it not been for this the goodly fabric of Methodism would never have come into being. But now that it has been reared, who does not see that it has been for the saving of the nations? By the energy of her character, by the organization of her ministry, by the diffusiveness and the purity of her zeal, by her own internal arrangements for the cultivation of personal piety and Christian experience, and the singleness of her purposes, she has spread out into the world, and sent a portion of her spirit to animate the formerly lifeless bodies of other denominations. How much religion was there in England when Wesley rose? Let the fact declare, that for preaching 'justification by faith in Christ alone,' ('articulus ipse stantis vel cadentis ecclesiæ,') and the convictions which followed, he was driven from the Church! And how much piety was there in the American Churches when Whitefield came over? Whitefield lit his torch at Wesley's altar, and bearing the flaming brand across the Atlantic, kindled the same fire in America that was already burning brightly in England. Then there arose the 'new lights,' as a term of reproach to indicate men of the new spirit, possessing the spirit that has now found its way in a good measure into all the Churches. We rejoice in it, we say again, and we doubt not that Wesley in heaven rejoices to see the diffusion of those principles which he spent his life in proclaiming. Meanwhile may the Church which he was the instrument of establishing ever be true to her own character. May her first principles never be abandoned, may her hands never be weakened, may the fire never burn low upon her altars; but with the same steadiness, devotedness, and singleness of purpose may she go on to 'spread Scriptural holiness all over the lands.' While we strive to keep up to the spirit of the age in all improvable things, let us keep up our own spirit in all heavenly things, and if we are true to that, to our latest generations the language of our dying founder shall be ours, 'The best of all is, God is with us.'

Before closing this article, may I be permitted to add a few words on another branch of this subject. It has appeared to us that there are two very prevalent errors in much of the preaching of the present day. First, our intellectual sermons are not always sufficiently practical.—Secondly, our practical sermons are not always sufficiently intellectual.

Many of the preachers who are characterized by deep research, and laborious thought, seem to take up the dogmas of their sects like party combatants, and their preaching is but an exhibition of theological gladiatorship. Or they select only such texts and subjects for the pulpit, as afford the greatest room for grand and magnificent display. One would be led to suppose, that their aim was not so much to adapt their subjects to the wants and edification of their hearers, as to the advantageous display of their own intellectual superiority. Yet is not this most absurd—and even humanly judged, most unbusiness like? What would be thought of a lawyer or a statesman, who, on rising to plead a cause, or urge the passage of a bill, instead of taking up the argument in a common-sense and business manner, should only dwell on those points that afford the greatest scope to display his imagination, or show forth the brilliancy of his genius? Suppose his design should be to exhibit his intellectual powers favorably to his auditory, rather than to substantiate his claims, and rather to entrance them with his eloquence, than to convince them by his arguments: his hearers indeed, might admire his talents, but they would not think highly of his efficiency. But, meanwhile, what would his clients or constituents say? They would prefer one half hour's plain, sound, earnest exhibition of their claims, to all his fine flourish, and deep-studied imbecility. The preacher's case is much the same. The object of the Gospel ministry is to bring sinners to Christ, and then to build them up in Scriptural holiness; and whenever this is not apparent throughout a discourse, when it is not the pervading spirit of the whole, when it strikes not upon the mind of the hearer as such, it is a mere perversion and profanation. It is splendid nonsense, or logical absurdity. What will Heaven think of one who is by profession a minister of reconciliation between God and man, an ambassador of God to a fallen world, who studies the entertainment of his hearers instead of their conversion and edification? Whose design is,

'To court a grin, where he should woo a soul.'

This indeed is pitiful, judged by human rules; but according to the word of God, it is worse than madness. Let the conduct of the apostles be ours also; 'We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord.' And let all our sermons say in spirit and purpose, 'Now then we are ambassadors for Christ. As though God did beseech you by us we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God.'

Neither are they to be excused who seem to think that the design to be useful exempts them from obligation to study. What! shall one man study utility, less than another display? Does it require less study, clearly, effectually, powerfully, to exhibit the purity and claims of the law, and the provisions of the Gospel, to convince, to awake, to instruct in all Christian doctrines and obligations, than merely to exhibit a little spice of human wit and ingenuity? Is the object less worthy and important? Certainly not; nor shall we be excused for

bestowing less study on it. No man has done all he can to preach Christ, and bring souls to God, who has not tasked his powers to the very utmost; and he who buries the talents Heaven has entrusted to him, or, which is the same thing, neglects to carry them out to their highest possible degree of perfection, must prepare to render up a fearful account of his stewardship. What is the result of a great many of those negligent, uninteresting, canting or prosing sermons, without taste or talent, and full of errors and inaccuracy, which issue from the pulpit? Why, the hearers are disgusted with religion and driven from the churches. The whole appearance of Christianity in such a dress is so unlovely, so utterly repulsive, that it even requires no ordinary portion of grace in the truly pious to endure it. What must it appear to those who are not pious? The intelligent and irreligious part of the community are thereby driven to those places where they find greater elegance, though a want of sound views and practical utility. And whose is the fault? Certainly our own, if it comes from our neglect of seeking proper qualifications for our business. Let us not content ourselves with saying that they run away from hearing the plain truths of the Gospel. It is perhaps not for preaching the truth, nor for strictly urging duty, that they abandon us. It is because we clothe the truth in a dress so slovenly and disgusting. We demand too much of persons who are not religious, when we expect them for the sake of truth they are not prepared to appreciate, to endure all the offensiveness with which it is possible to invest it. And how unreasonable it is to leave all the graces and attractiveness of the pulpit, to the cause of error or of heterodoxy, and act as if any thing was good enough for the truth and for practical purposes! What churches this mode of preaching will fill, and which it will empty is very apparent; and the effect stares us in the face every where. Let us not be met with the stale and worn-out objection, that the apostles did not study their sermons. Before we bring this fact to justify indolence and sanctify our own follies, let us wait until we can substantiate our claims to their inspiration.

In conclusion, we hope we shall not be charged with looking to human applause in the pulpit preparations. This is not our design.—We only desire to see justice done to the cause of God, and of human souls. We wish always to see truth presented as it ought to be, in the clearest, fullest, strongest, and most effectual manner. And in order to do this, two things are necessary, that, first of all, the heart be imbued with the spirit of piety, and then, that the whole strength of the intellect and all the resources of mind be expended upon our work,—the unction that cometh from above, and the full exertion of whatever talents Heaven may have given. In a word, let the errors we have described be avoided, and let whatever is excellent in the two classes of ministers be conjoined. Let the intellectual be always decidedly practical, and let the practical become more intellectual. We shall then see our churches filled with more intelligent hearers, and more of them will be converted. We shall then see an end of that invidious distinction which now so generally prevails between *great* preachers and *useful* preachers. A man will no longer be looked on with suspicion among the pious and simple-hearted, when he exhibits marks of thought and investigation in his sermons, as if he was turn-

ing traitor to his sacred obligations. And the weakness and follies of others will not pass current for sure marks of simplicity of purpose and purity of heart. We shall then have no empty sound and frothy nonsense in the pulpit, on the one hand; nor on the other, those tame and spiritless anodynes which convert our churches into dormitories, or which leave the minister to gather the evidences of his usefulness from empty benches. All then will be 'good to the use of edifying,' when every man employs his talents to the best advantage for holy and spiritual purposes. Then shall 'peace be within our walls and prosperity within our palaces,' and the purposes of Heaven in bestowing a diversity of gifts and qualifications upon the Church, shall be fully manifest. Then shall He be supremely glorified, 'who gave unto some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'

J. HOLDICH.

New-York, April 29, 1835.

THE MORAL INFLUENCE OF THE FINE ARTS.

A Lecture delivered before the Boston Wesleyan Lyceum.

BY EDWARD OTHEMAN.

THE object of this lecture is not, of course, to notice the whole extent and variety of the moral influence of the fine arts, or of any one of them, for this would be impossible in the short space allotted for this exercise. Our design simply is to exhibit their claims, as a class of human pursuits, and a source of human enjoyment, to be either extensively or partially patronized and cultivated. And this it is intended to do chiefly by showing that their *native* tendency is favorable to morality.

The arts termed fine, polite or liberal, when spoken of abstractly or without relation to other arts, are painting, sculpture, and architecture; but in the popular or common division of the arts, (which will be adopted in this lecture,) the fine arts consist of such as music, painting, sculpture, rhetoric, gardening, architecture, engraving, and are distinguished from the useful or mechanical arts by their respective objects. The object of the latter is to produce utility or profit, that of the former is to please, or to gratify the taste, by exhibiting whatever they can that is graceful, lovely, elegant, novel, wonderful or sublime. Absolute or relative beauty is a quality common to all their productions, and it is by the power of their works to raise this emotion that we judge of the perfection of those works. Some of the fine arts are also useful; still the most striking, the outward expression of their productions is ornamental. Such are architecture and gardening.

By their moral influence, I mean that influence which they exert on the mind and heart, in favor both of individual and social morality; not, of course, as producing convictions of duty, but as a means of cultivating those feelings and sentiments which deter from vice and

prompt to virtue. And here we speak of their legitimate, unperverted influence; for the proper question with regard to any principle or pursuit is, what is its natural character and tendency? Are the fine arts, then, in their nature, destructive or promotive of morality? We do not ask, what their actual influence is in any particular time or place, because they, like every thing else, may be abused by the passions and prejudices of men; but, do they necessarily contain the elements of moral corruption? or are they not, when properly used, made direct and efficient aids of virtue? are they not really, bright manifestations of man's noble powers—the embodying of his beau ideal of excellence—the means of attempting to operate favorably on the mind, by the visible or audible expression of those ideas of perfection, the contemplation of which tends to render ourselves more perfect? We pretend not to say, that they are any thing more than aids to morality; but we do contend that, other things being equal, where they are cultivated in a proper manner there will be a more elevated, refined, elegant state of society,—that the selfishness and narrowness of human nature will be removed, and the social principles and character more fully developed.

It is no small argument in favor of the propriety and importance of their cultivation by the religious part of the community, though they were merely innocent in their tendency, that they will always, doubtless, exist; and it is certainly wise and politic, that those who regard the moral interests of man should employ a machinery of so extensive power, capable of so varied application, for the welfare of society.—The belief that they will always be admired and pursued, is supported by the fact, that they are founded deeply in nature, in the nature of man, and of the external world. This fact appears by considering their relation to the mind, and their own character and history. And it might be a short, but comprehensive and true answer to our inquiries on this subject, that their moral tendency must be good, since they exist by the very constitution of nature herself, and hence, by the appointment of Jehovah. But let this point be illustrated a little. Some of the fine arts are imitative, as painting and sculpture; others are the natural, spontaneous productions of man's powers, as music, poetry, and oratory. Each of these classes sometimes partakes of both characteristics, and sometimes one performs the office of the other. The three last named seem to owe their existence to a sort of impulse or inspiration in the mind, and to be the very language of some of man's dearest and noblest emotions and faculties. Fired with some high resolve, exulting in some joyous anticipation or accomplished hope, melted into exquisite tenderness by some fond affection, he pours out his soul in enchanting music, enrapturing poesy, or entrancing eloquence. These seem to belong to human nature, as much as any instinct does to the lower animals. The organs of the human voice are exactly adapted to music and oratory, while the principles of music, whether vocal or instrumental, are absolutely fixed in the very nature of musical sounds. Of poetry the universe itself is full, at least to the eye of fancy; and there are depths of feeling and of thought in man, all 'unwritten poetry,' the source of that expressed either in his actions or his language.

The propensity to imitation is common to man, and leads even now

the rude sons of the forest to carve on wood or stone some rough resemblance to the human form and face. The glassy surface of the calm lake, mirroring, in beauty, forest, field or village, either burnished with the golden blaze of sunlight, or softened into milder radiance by the silvery beams of the full moon, would suggest a means of picturing out, in a more durable form, all the charms of a landscape, as a memento of scenes and hours of friendship now far distant, or long passed away. The varied beauty of nature in the green velvet lawn, and the embroidered meadow, the gently meandering river, and the roaring cataract, the grave-browed mountain, and the sleeping valley, no doubt gave rise to the art of gardening. The magnificent temples of nature, whose roof of thickly intertwining branches, and closely thatched leaves, is supported by strong and graceful columns of various forms, possibly furnished the first idea of architecture, and contributed, assuredly, to the perfection of the art.

That the fine arts are the legitimate result of the laws of mind, seems farther evident from their adaptation to the mental constitution, from the involuntary, spontaneous approbation shown them in all ages and lands, and by all classes of society. This universal admiration arises from their appealing to a common principle of human nature—taste—which, though differing in some of its applications, is essentially the same in all mankind. Taste is somewhat analogous to the love of nature, and serves the same end with respect to human productions, as the love of nature does with respect to natural objects. They are sometimes both called taste; and it is a fact, so nearly are they allied to each other, that by improving one of them we improve the other at the same time. The love of nature seems, indeed, to have been the origin of the fine arts, of those, at least, which are imitative. Both of these principles were, doubtless, implanted within us for good purposes, and their final cause, which we cannot now consider, is as honorable to the Divine wisdom and goodness as serviceable to man.

That department of the mind over which the fine arts peculiarly and immediately preside, is an important one, and is, in fact, that over which morality and religion exercise their greatest control. It is the sensitive part of our nature—the passions and emotions. And here we see the grand reason why their moral influence should be seriously considered, because they touch the springs of action; and why, though founded in nature, their application and use should be sacredly guarded, so as to prevent the perversion of their original purpose.

That they have great and extensive power over the mind, whether for good or for evil, appears probable from their nature and qualities, and certain from history and experience. Take a few instances of this power from observation. The power of music, poetry, and oratory is too obvious and too generally acknowledged to need illustration or argument. The corrupting power of painting, when employed for vicious purposes, is so great as to require the interference of legislative enactments, and of the civil authority for its removal, at least, from contact with the public eye. Painting and sculpture, as agents of superstition and false religion, have held extensive control over the mind in the systems of idolatry; and the Divine prohibition of this use of them by the second commandment is, at once, an evidence of the propensity of the human mind to cultivate these arts, and of the won-

derful power which they are capable of wielding. Having the common approbation of all classes, the fine arts can, by taking advantage of the times, by favoring some reigning prejudice or passion of the age, mould and direct the popular mass at will. The founders and ministers of a certain Church, noted for their knowledge of human nature, have availed themselves of all the powerful attractions of the arts in the construction, decoration, and service of their magnificent cathedrals and other places of worship, to strengthen the attachment, and secure the veneration of its members for its doctrines and usages. And though the improper and extravagant use made of these arts in that Church may have brought them into a degree of disrepute and neglect by other portions of Christendom, still should we not show more wisdom in retaining the good, while we reject the bad, and in making use of the same lawful means to bind the heart to principles and practices which we consider pure and holy. The universal power which the fine arts have acquired over all men in civilized countries, is seen in the eagerness with which specimens of them are sought, either for the immediate gratification of the taste, or for the embellishment of their dwellings as objects of frequent delight. Greece and Italy are only other names for all that is beautiful and perfect in works of art; and it is interesting to observe the whole civilized world leaning toward them with intent gaze, and ardent desire, to behold their charms and catch their inspiration. The poet, the philosopher, the conqueror, the common traveller, seeks to obtain a fragment even of their architectural columns, their marble statues, their sculptured monuments, not only as a sacred relic of their former glory, but also as a rare and exquisite specimen of unrivalled art. The desire and the practice, prevalent among all classes of society, of obtaining some appropriate and durable memento of love and friendship, as a bust or a picture, is as strong a testimony to our sense of the power of the arts which produce them, as it is to the tender and touching sentiment of our hearts toward the loved and the departed.

Whatever possesses such a command over the hearts and actions of men, whatever seems destined to maintain its empire through all generations, is certainly a proper subject for the scrutiny and guardianship of the Christian and the philanthropist; and if it do not contain any thing necessarily repugnant to morality, should be made, in the hands of religion, to subserve the high purposes of human happiness and improvement.

The persons on whom the fine arts exert an influence consist of two classes; first, artists themselves; and second, the admirers or observers of the arts. Though their influence is felt by both classes in common, it must be greatest on those, whether professors or connoisseurs, who are most conversant with them. All that can be done at present, however, is to consider their influence as exerted on the general mind.

Their moral influence is of two kinds, original, native or inherent, and relative or derived, sometimes distinctly felt, but generally felt in union or combination. The relative influence flows from two sources; one, the subject which they treat of or exhibit, the other, the faculty, passion or emotion which they are intended to excite. Some of them admit of only one source of relative influence, e. g., gardening and architecture. These cannot, perhaps, be properly said to

exhibit different subjects of consideration, but they can be made to raise various emotions, as cheerfulness or melancholy, gayety or sobriety, tranquillity, confidence or terror, beauty or sublimity. In order to have a distinct idea of these two kinds of influence, let us take an example from some one of the fine arts in which they both exist. We will examine a painting of David, the founder of the modern French school of painting, which represents 'Cain meditating the death of Abel.' Cain is represented as large as life. He appears in the foreground, facing the beholder, and is the most conspicuous figure in the picture. He is sitting on a broken rock; a green lawn is spread out from his feet before him, and behind him, on his right, waves a forest of luxuriant vegetation. In the distance, on a glade opening at his left, and stretching far away behind him, the pious Abel is kneeling reverently before a rude altar of stone, from which the flame of his sacrifice is sending up a grateful perfume to Heaven. The offended and indignant Cain is the very personification of malice and revenge. He is agitated with intolerable rage. Every muscle is swelled to perfect distinctness. His erect, inflexible neck, his closely pressed lips, his wide-spread nostrils, his blood-shot eyeballs, his dark and wrinkled brow, are still more striking indications of the settled fury and purpose of his soul. His right leg slightly bent under him, resting on the toes; his left one in its natural, upright position, but firmly planted; his left hand, extended at the full length of the arm, clenching and pressing perpendicularly upon the ground an implement of husbandry, soon to become an instrument of death; and his right hand bearing strongly upon his right thigh, strikingly represent him as in the act of springing from his seat to perpetrate his murderous design. Now who can look on that perfectly natural coloring, that accurate delineation of features and expression, that admirable perspective, every object, every part standing up from the canvass as though it were the living scene itself, without feeling an electric thrill of delight. This is the spontaneous homage which taste pays to genius; and is the effect produced by the fine design and painting of the picture, or by the original, inherent influence of this specimen of art. Then the subject which the painter has chosen is one of deep interest. We think of the causes at work, the characters displayed, and other circumstances exhibited in the scene, and thus this subject suggests considerations calculated to produce a good moral effect. Then, again, the picture is addressed to several emotions in the beholder, such as commiseration for the innocent victim of revenge, abhorrence of the crime, and disgust at the indulgence of a malevolent disposition. Now the adaptation of the picture to excite these emotions, and the subject exhibited in it, constitute the two sources of relative influence. It will be perceived from this example, that the latter influence must be, or may be made, far greater than the former, since into the latter can be thrown all the incentives to vice or virtue, all the elements of moral purity or corruption. And in the use made of this influence lies the greatest danger. Subjects and emotions are, indeed, the instruments which both depraved and consecrated genius employs to effect its purposes. Let the fine arts be used by suitable minds in a proper way, and their power to bless mankind will be universally acknowledged. But whatever may be their application, their inherent or native influence remains

the same in character, though not always in force, because it may be overpowered by the relative influence; and this character, it will be shown, is good. Since, then, their relative influence is determined in its character by no fixed principles, but by the will of the artist, and of the age, and is open and manifest to the discernment of all, we will confine ourselves in our future observations to the consideration and illustration of their native influence on individual and social morality.

This influence, it must be confessed, is rather passive than active in its results, tending to restrain and chasten the feelings and passions, rather than to excite to immediate action. But this effect, if no other were produced, would not be of small importance in a world where the turbulence of passion and irregular desires is so common and so ruinous to morals and happiness. This, however, is not the only effect in every case. Eloquence or oratory, in its essential characteristics, is exciting to the active principles of our nature. And, indeed, the more imperceptible influence alluded to above, will, in the end, powerfully affect our conduct, since that generally partakes of the temper of our minds.

The first consideration which I will offer, to show that the native tendency of the fine arts is good, is, that their object is consistent with, and promotive of morality. This object is, in general, to please; in particular, to please by exciting the emotions of beauty and grandeur or sublimity. Now if their tendency were to please by gratifying the corrupt passions, every virtuous mind would condemn them at once; but they please because we are constituted by nature to be so affected by them; they please, because they gratify our taste, a common faculty of mind, which controls us, almost instinctively, in many of the arrangements of life. They please in the same way as nature pleases, and with the same end in view, the happiness of man. There is something in the mind of man which fits him to receive delight from the objects of sense. Some of these objects are necessary to his subsistence; still from these he receives a pleasure which, though from experience he finds it not absolutely requisite to his being, yet is an essential ingredient in his cup of happiness. Other objects seem not at all necessary to his existence, but are, nevertheless, some of the fullest sources of his enjoyment. These latter objects furnish that infinite diversity of charms, thronging upon his vision from the ever-varying face of heaven and of earth. Whose soul swells not with rapture at sight of the glorious sky, the budding spring, the flowering summer, the fruitful autumn, the rudely majestic winter, sublime in storms, and beautiful in the glittering, sun-gemmed snow? To please, then, seems to be a purpose not unworthy of, nor neglected by the Deity; and the effect which this kind of pleasure has upon the mind, is a mark both of Divine wisdom and goodness. Perhaps, then, we may be justified in saying, that to please, provided the pleasure be not immoral in its tendencies, and especially if it tends to improve the intellect and the heart, is a good object, and one that should be aimed at in our social intercourse. The mind, under the benignant influence of the charms of nature, is either softened or elevated, and is thus better prepared to attend to the lessons of religion, and, indeed, to be affected by the moral reflections which come from every point of the

universe. And the same effect do the beauties of the fine arts produce on those who contemplate and admire them.

That the pleasure derived from the fine arts is moral in its character and tendencies, is seen more clearly by considering the peculiar emotions of which it chiefly consists, viz. beauty and sublimity. The moral effect of these emotions is always good. The expansion and complacence of mind caused by the sight of a beautiful object, the mental elevation and vigor produced by a sublime one, are very far removed from the low and grovelling dispositions of vice. Indeed, a vicious man cannot have a full impression of the pure beauties of nature or of art. They will always be distorted or perverted to his gaze, and associated with images of sensual gratification. An artist, in order to produce finished specimens of his art, is obliged, if he be a vicious man in general, to suspend the indulgence of his animal propensities a while, and strive to assume a sobriety—a purity, suited to the nature of his profession. For the improvement of man's social, intellectual, and moral nature, God has seen fit to impress certain aspects on natural objects, and to diffuse certain influences through the universe, apart from a recorded revelation, which he has adapted man to perceive, and which insinuate themselves, in his happy hours, in an agreeable, undefinable manner, into his heart, and insensibly mould his character. Among those aspects and influences, as the most striking appearances of nature, and the most congenial and successful in their operation upon the mind, are beauty and sublimity; and these, so important and extensive is the power of the fine arts, He has also imprinted upon *them*, with the same far-seeing and benevolent intention. The powerful agency of the grand and lovely local scenery of a country, in soothing, chastening, and elevating the mind, and in forming the peculiar genius and character of the individual and the nation, has always been acknowledged. These qualities in the fine arts would produce the same effect, to the same extent, were they as freely and as frequently open to public inspection. We are naturally led from the consideration of these qualities, whether in nature or in art, to reverence the Infinite Intelligence who has enabled man to produce the one and imitate the other, and who has by them shown himself possessed of attributes and perfections which render him an object supremely worthy of man's adoring contemplation.

2. And by these thoughts we are led to a second consideration, showing that the inherent or native influence of the fine arts is good, viz., the susceptibility of the human mind to imbibe the spirit of the scenes and circumstances by which it is employed and interested. It is a common saying, and true to some extent, that man is the creature of circumstances; i. e., that his character is formed by the circumstances attending his being. How far his character is affected by his condition, by the objects and events continually occurring under his notice, is a profound problem, and difficult of solution. It is unquestionable, however, that the scenes through which he passes, and especially those of great importance, do leave their mark upon him.—These scenes form the character or the spirit of the age—of the nation; and most of the public, and much of the private character of individuals. So climate and localities seem to affect the physical and intellectual constitution of man, in individual cases, and especially in suc-

cessive generations. Thus men living in moderately rigorous climates, when compared with the inhabitants of countries of higher and more uniform temperature, are, other things being equal, generally distinguished for stern, firm, calculating purpose, for unconquerable perseverance and industry, for kind and hospitable, but rather rigid and guarded manners; while the directer rays of the sun, and milder breezes, produce more yielding dispositions, more ardent temperaments, more unsuspecting, full-souled generosity of feeling and of manners, but, at the same time, more rash, impetuous daring. The indolent, luxurious effeminacy of the Italians, the contemplative, phlegmatic laboriousness of the Germans, the gay, busy, intelligent sprightliness of the French, the proud, enthusiastic ardor of the Spanish, the quick-sighted, high-spirited, interested shrewdness of the English, the simple-hearted, enterprising, independent spirit of the Americans, are national characteristics, the result of the origin, age, government, religion, education, climate, local scenery, &c, of the respective nations. The polished manners, the lofty bearing, the extensive aims and efforts of worldly ambition, generally found in persons of high rank, are not so much attributable to any innate mental superiority as to the circumstances of their breeding. Minds of as noble powers, as fine sensibility, may always be found in the humbler walks of life; but, owing to the want of culture, the force of example, and the less stirring scenes of daily contact, they are more circumscribed in their prospect, and concealed under a more uncouth and forbidding exterior. Ten thousand occurrences in the natural and moral world are constantly making their impression upon our intellect or our heart. It is the part of wisdom and of virtue to consider well these occurrences and their effects, and to court the occasions of good and gentle influence, repelling, most watchfully, the insidious, enervating tendency of vicious scenes and objects.

Now it is natural to suppose that objects of contemplation so attractive and impressive as the fine arts are, would impart something of their peculiar qualities to our thoughts and feelings, and thus, in the result, to our character and deportment. Our character is formed, and we are, in general, actuated, more by our senses, our feelings and our imagination, than by any thing else within us. Most men are what they are more from the ideas which they receive from the world around them, than from those which they originate. Indeed, by far the greater number of our first ideas are suggested by surrounding persons and objects; and, excepting the faculties, by which we receive, combine, and employ these ideas, and which, in some instances, create a world of their own, we grow up mere copies or imitations of what has already been. How then is it possible for us to be unaffected by the fine arts, whenever seen, which appeal so powerfully and triumphantly to our taste and sentiments. The fine arts, in their perfection, are re-creations of nature. All that is touching, thrilling, captivating, in the physical world, is present in some one or other of the arts. And though life, and soul, and intellect do not literally exist in their productions, yet in all is seen and felt the pervading power and spell of genius; and in some, so manifest and striking is the impression which mind has left upon them, there is needed no conjurer's wand to call up during their perusal or examination, within the circle of our fancy and almost

of our senses, beautiful and glorious forms, all instinct with life, and thought, and feeling. When art is thus successful, we seem, sometimes, by beholding to become the beings which it represents. We feel the inspiration which they are made to feel, the same emotions and passions agitate our breast, the same beauty, grandeur, majesty, pervades our mind, till we are as wise as the wisest, good as the best, in short, great as the greatest of those that act on the page of literature, breathe on canvass, or think and speak in marble. And though in some instances, and in some respects, this result may be prejudicial to our true interest, still it is just what we all feel, in a greater or less degree, even without those means of exciting or gratifying such a feeling. It is but the stirring within us of that desire of improving our condition, that aiming at perfection, that undefinable longing after something great and glorious, which, though perverted by the fall, still clings to our nature, as the susceptibility of the soul to experience all those high hopes and influences provided in the Gospel for all who fulfil their just and easy terms. These very efforts of the mind to expand its present narrow sphere of thought and feeling, whether they are put forth by the native, unassisted vigor of the soul, or roused by noble examples in real life, or by ideal images of exquisite grace, towering grandeur, lofty intellect or moral worth, in the fine arts, will always tend to purify and dignify the sentiments of the heart. No person of taste can witness and contemplate, occasionally, and especially always, as artists do, the beautiful or the grand in music, painting, sculpture, or architecture, without imbibing somewhat of their spirit. A man feels his soul erecting, nerving, preparing herself for action, through the impulse communicated to his emotions by the perception or conception of those qualities. He feels ennobled by the recollection of human skill, and by the consciousness of power to produce or enjoy such wonderful works.

But the fine arts produce corresponding qualities in the mind most successfully, or increase them when produced, by calling into constant and vigorous exercise one of the intellectual faculties, most extensive and efficient in its influence on all the rest of man's complex nature: I mean the imagination. Next to the perception of external objects, this faculty has the widest and strongest control over men in general. It is one of the chief instruments of the happiness or misery of man. This faculty is the foundation of taste and genius. It furnishes genius with the materials of its operations, and taste with a kind of exhibition-gallery, in which it may steadily observe, and calmly decide on the creations of genius both before and after they are produced for the inspection of the senses. While the imagination possesses so much power, the emotions excited by the fine arts are those in which it most delights, and it is frequently forming combinations suited to raise them. Under the influence of a depraved heart, this faculty is apt to be disordered in its aims and operations; but God has wisely so ordained that it can be, and ordinarily is gratified with the exhibition of those qualities which are harmless, if they are not as holy, and contain as much earthly, if not as much heavenly purity, as the sublimer attributes of religion. Now the employment of either genius or taste in the fine arts rouses and stimulates the imagination, so that, even after this employment, it is apt to form combinations of thought and senti-

ment similar to those on which it has been exercised through the senses. Thus does the mind receive a lasting impression—a fadeless hue, from those qualities which are presented to its perception. These ideas of the imagination have a powerful influence on all the character, and give their peculiar expression to the conduct; and hence we see the importance of directing genius to the production of such works as will furnish no improper aliment to the imagination. The forming of mental images of rare and exquisite natural or moral grace, loveliness or sublimity, always produces a good effect upon the character and manners. He who cultivates either taste or genius in the arts, lives, by his imagination, amid scenes of natural or moral beauty or grandeur; and he grows mild, gentle, and happy, in some sunny spot of earth, with affectionate, refined society about him,—or brave, independent, and dignified, amid the magnificence and sublimity of mountains, oceans, and storms, or among the soul-stirring scenes of grand civil or political movements.

3. I will venture a third observation on the good tendency of the fine arts. The exercise or cultivation which the study and examination of works of art give to the sensitive part of our nature, refines and improves our sensibilities, and thus renders us more easily and deeply affected by the scenes of real life. There is danger, it is true, that our sensibilities may be exhausted or blunted by excessive excitement in the contemplation of images of mere ideal existence, or become morbid, in the same way, so as to be affected at improper times, and by unworthy objects; but this result will be owing to an erroneous employment of powers and means intended for our welfare. Experience and observation seem, however, to establish the general fact. Hence a person of true refinement of taste is more susceptible of pleasure and pain,—of pleasure at the good of others, and of pain at their misfortunes. Such a person will be less liable to injure the feelings of another, and will never do it wantonly. He has a keen sense of self-respect, and of the respect and decorum becoming him on all occasions. There is a simplicity, affability, and condescension about one of cultivated sensibility, as honorable to himself as it is agreeable to his associates. Such an individual possesses a deep sympathy with humanity, and rejoices in all enterprises undertaken for the benefit of mankind.

It is true the fine sensibilities of the heart may be improved by social intercourse; but it is no small recommendation of the arts, that they are conducive to so important a result. And though their tendency to produce this effect may not be the most powerful inducement to the pursuit of them, yet, seeing they are and will be pursued for other very valuable purposes, it is gratifying to observe that they are naturally, and may be made particularly conducive to the improvement of those generous and benevolent feelings which are needed in the every-day occurrences of life. And this they do, on a principle applicable in every department of education, viz.—the cultivation of any power of the mind on a given subject prepares that power to be used more easily on every other subject; so, by a proper employment of our taste or sensibility in the fine arts, it becomes more readily excited in the common affairs of life.

Though a system of education directed mainly to the cultivation of

the moral powers and feelings, and professedly exclusive of the aid of the fine arts, may and will develop the kind and amiable affections, yet we feel prepared to say that it will not do this so agreeably without their aid, and indeed, will not do this really without the application of some of their chief elementary principles. The love of nature, the cultivation of which such a system would not neglect, leads, as we have seen, directly to the production of some of the arts. Just taste and cultivated genius always produce representations true to nature, and delight in nothing more than in the exhibition of whatever is tender and touching in its character,—elevating and chastening in its tendency. Hence, among the most legitimate, pure, and lovely of the works of art are those scenes and objects highly distinguished for all that is delicate, gentle, and refined. In inculcating these qualities, therefore, we inculcate those which it is the province and the glory of art to exhibit and excite. In such an education, it would be necessary to make some representation of the scenes which call for the exercise of benevolence and sympathy, and in doing this, some one or more of the fine arts, in its imperfect manifestation, at least, must be employed. How much better to allow the mind a free range through all the beautiful walks and fields of genius, where it may find delightful gratification for its high and ardent aspirations, agreeable and vigorous exercise for all its affections and powers, and many useful hints and instructions for its future occupation and direction. And from these last remarks we may see that the fine arts would improve our sensibilities, not only by improving our taste, but also by employing, for this purpose, through the representation of suitable qualities, the susceptibility of the mind, already mentioned, to imbibe the spirit of those objects which come under its notice.

Closely connected with this topic is the consideration that persons of refined taste and genius abhor every thing vulgar and mean. The elevation and comparative purity of sentiment which such persons enjoy prevent them from addicting themselves to low and grovelling vice. And though, owing to erroneous education, their contempt of vice may sometimes be transferred to the person of the vicious man, so as to prevent them from making any attempt to reform him, yet they should know that correct taste, as well as pure morality, would teach them to endeavor to reform the vicious, just as it would teach a person of neatness and order to remedy any defect in his dress or apartment. One special way in which the arts produce the effect just noticed is, that they attract from vice by the superior pleasures which they afford. The man who has a relish for them possesses a more cheerful disposition than another otherwise similarly situated. His love of nature is increased at the same time with his taste, and he finds objects of delightful interest where all is blank or gloomy to another. Society, in its varied forms and operations, furnishes him, at any time, with fresh and interesting subjects of admiring contemplation. The character and furniture of his mind dispose him to be happy in himself, and promote his social enjoyment.

4. In the fourth place, an important moral end of the fine arts is the fuller development which the cultivation of them gives to the whole man. Their intellectual domain is an extensive one, and they seem to be its fittest and most natural proprietors and inhabitants. Either

in a rude or polished state, they generally occupy it; and if brought under the supreme direction and influence of the rightful sovereign of the mind, they will greatly contribute to the advantage and happiness of the whole man. True, other departments of the soul may for a while usurp their place, but disorder, in some form or other, must be the final result of this partial or imperfect arrangement; and if their province is left unoccupied by its proper owners, it will probably be filled with powers inimical and prejudicial to the best interests of man. One prominent cause of the ruin of many individuals, is the partial culture of their intellectual and moral natures. Ignorance, or imperfect mental cultivation, is the origin and supporter of prejudice; but prejudice and passion, under the influence of true principles of taste, will be restrained, if not in their inward existence, at least in their outward expression and tendencies. Hence the importance of improving the taste, which can be done most effectually by the influence of the fine arts. This influence begets liberality of soul, and is an enticement to the pursuit of other studies, suited to the development of the mind. And we may say with truth, that the more the mind is enlarged, other things being equal, the greater is its moral power.

There will happen seasons in the life of many, if not of all, when circumstances may require a long retirement from the active business of the world, and when, owing to the natural activity of the mind, and the necessity of varied exercise in support of its vigor and comfort, we shall, if we have not this varied exercise, be in danger either of turning our cankering anxieties and thoughts upon ourselves, or else of weakening or polluting our souls with frivolous or sinful occupations. And at such seasons, and in those leisure hours which all men have, a taste and genius in some one or more of the fine arts will be found eminently serviceable.

The pursuit and study of the fine arts give exercise to the reasoning powers, and increase the powers of attention and discrimination. This increased mental activity we shall naturally employ on other subjects, as those of moral speculation and moral duty, and thus we may be led indirectly and agreeably to those convictions which may have a useful control over our whole character. Take another view of this point. Though taste is by no means the criterion by which to judge the moral character of actions, still it is, perhaps, no less true that just taste will always be found conformed to the dictates of sound morality. Hence such a taste may be, in some cases, a valuable auxiliary to the moral sense. The Divine Wisdom seems to have so arranged His moral government as to give sufficient instruction on the great general principles of morality and religion, so that every one may have the means of salvation, and, at the same time, to leave every one, for his own good, to the employment of all his powers in the application of those principles to the details and minutiæ of life. Hence the office of conscience and reason is not abolished nor contracted by revelation, but these talents, with others, are given us to be strengthened and enlarged by use. There may be passages in our experience in which the precise moral aspect of a contemplated action may not be distinctly seen, and we need all the lights of the mind to be poured upon it. And especially may there be cases, in which, though moral obligation may be clearly discerned, yet the manner of performing the

action may depend on principles of taste. Take an example from sacred history. An illustrious personage has perpetrated a foul, enormous crime. He has robbed one of his most useful subjects first of the dearest object of his affections, and next of his life, but as yet he seems insensible of the magnitude of the evil. It is necessary to awaken his conscience, and produce his repentance. A holy prophet is sent by God to him for this purpose. He goes, he does his duty faithfully, and accomplishes his object. But Nathan is guided, in his address to David, as the best means of producing the result, by the true principles of oratory.

5. The moral influence of the fine arts on national character, will be briefly and imperfectly considered, in the fifth and last place.—Their tendency is to humanize and civilize the public mind. They naturally contain nothing savage, cruel, or vicious, either in their principles or legitimate operations. Indeed, they were the chief instruments in ancient civilization, and the principal marks by which an improved state of society was distinguished from the barbarity of other tribes. A remarkable instance of the humanizing tendency of music was exhibited in the condition of one of the tribes of the ancient Greeks in Peloponessus. It was observed that the Arcadians were much more gentle in their dispositions, and, of course, more amiable in their manners, than their neighbors in the surrounding districts; and as they were enthusiastically devoted to music, which their neighbors did not cultivate, their mildness of character was justly believed to be the effect of its power. The fine arts always accompany civilization, and seem to be one of its essential, but, certainly, one of its universal elements, both in ancient and in modern times.

They furnish a species of popular amusement of elevated character. This amusement holds a middle rank between the gratification of the animal, sensual appetites and passions, and the high exercises of the understanding, and hence is an agreeable relaxation from the one, and a powerful attraction from the other. This amusement occupies this relation by consisting partly of pleasures of sense, and partly of intellectual exercises. The senses, however, which are thus gratified, are the noblest, and their pleasures most dignified, viz. the sight and hearing. These are the noblest of the senses, because they are most nearly allied to purely mental operations, since the impressions made on their bodily organs are not perceptible. It seems to be necessary to our greatest happiness in this state of being, that we should have some relaxation of mind; and God seems to have constituted us and external nature so as to effect this purpose among others. Now the higher the enjoyment, the better the effect upon the mind and heart. Hence the sounds and sights of nature afford the most agreeable and useful pleasures; and the exhibitions of the fine arts, so similar to these, have almost an equal claim on our attention. The amusements of a people have a powerful influence on their moral character; and, no doubt, bull-baiting, and other barbarous sports, engender or foster that peculiar recklessness of life, and fierceness of temper and manners, common to the people who practise or encourage them.—Letters and arts exert a moralizing influence, not only by exercising higher senses than the gross indulgences of taste, smell, and touch do, but also by giving gentle and useful exercise to the intellectual pow-

ers and moral feelings, (the employment of which, as has been stated, is beneficial to the character,) which such sports as those just alluded to do not furnish.

It requires an advanced state of society, and the existence of high intellectual endowments, for the production and appreciation of finished specimens of art. Now, though extensive mental cultivation does not imply always, and is not always accompanied by, great religious culture, still, since in such a condition, other things being equal, the moral and social feelings will be considerably refined, and since it is desirable to advance the intellectual improvement of a people, therefore the fine arts should receive a due share of patronage. The more food there is for the mind, the more the mind gains ascendancy over appetites and passions. And the more agreeable the means by which instruction and mental culture can be given, the more readily and successfully will they be attended to. Furthermore, the object of these arts, especially of those called fine arts in history, painting, sculpture, and architecture, not being so much pecuniary profit, but being more absolutely the gratification of the taste, the result of their pursuit is the enlargement and increased liberality of the mind. The pursuit of gain, of money, and almost all the occupations of mere business, have a tendency to cramp and circumscribe the mind. It needs some agreeable and ingenious occupation for its leisure hours, and fitted to draw it away from the engrossing cares of business. The exercise of formative skill, or of high relish, in these arts, produces this effect; and the tendency of these arts to do so is probably one reason, but not the particular one, of their being called liberal. Hence those times and countries, when and where the liberal arts flourished, were distinguished for intellectual superiority, for the general prevalence of a fondness for, and a just appreciation of, the labors of taste and genius. Thus a noble spirit of emulation was excited, directed to gratify this generous and elevated state of public refinement. And, though it may be difficult to decide whether it was owing to this superior mental cultivation and liberality of sentiment, or not, we, nevertheless, find that those nations, if they did not receive Christianity soonest, having once received, retained it the longest, and were permanently affected by it in all their affairs. It was corrupted among them, after some time, it is true, but yet it made a lasting improvement in their condition in many important particulars.

Their influence is an important element in that grand department of political or national morality—patriotism, or love of country. The cultivation of them makes us take a greater interest in the natural aspects and phenomena of the country, and its inhabitants. We are necessarily led to observe and study its scenery more, its resources, its climate. We wish to give birth and being to that almost innate attachment to our native land, which all her true children feel. We therefore desire to portray and describe her skies—her rivers—her ocean shores—her mountains, plains, and valleys—her spring—her summer—her various productions. We seek to be inspired by her charms, and she increases the ardor of our love toward her. So also her history, and the history of her inhabitants, furnish many an interesting theme for the employment of the muses. Song, sculpture, painting, eloquence, are all busy with its scenes and events. The manners of

the inhabitants, too, are sources of thrilling interest to genius. These it delights to immortalize for amusement and instruction. Whatever the hand of genius touches, it endues with a tenfold charm. We always take more pleasure in the view of scenes already made familiar to our imagination by the magic wand of poetry and painting.

Again, the more objects of endearment there are in a country, the more tenaciously do her faithful citizens cling to her memory, and the more bravely do they stand in her defence. Works of art and literature, being objects of deep and general admiration, always furnish nourishment and strength to this important principle of our nature.—They make a land more elegant and lovely, and therefore more dearly beloved, in the same way as multiplying the attractions of our home, renders us more firmly and tenderly attached to our domestic circle and fireside. The eras and the climes of song, of eloquence, in short, of taste and genius, possess a delightful interest in our hearts, seem to have an ethereal, spiritual character, and we cherish their memory among our most tender and hallowed recollections. The creations of genius, in the arts, seem to give a reality, a permanent existence, to the bright and splendid dreams of our youthful fancy; and these dreams are what of our early years we most love to dwell upon. The works of art always maintain their empire, since the imagination, which is the same in all generations, finds in them the full and beautiful accomplishment of its lofty aspirations, its ardent searchings, its mysterious operations. Thus to the present, and to future ages, they will ever possess an indescribable charm, and will consecrate, in the affections and admiration of all men, the land that contains them, and especially the land that produces them.

We are too apt to forget the universal power of taste—that the objects of its gratification possess a kind of sacredness in its view—and that it may be made widely instrumental in promoting the welfare of ourselves, our country, and our posterity. If not for our own sakes, as individuals, yet, certainly, for the sake of our country and our children, we should patronize and encourage the arts. It is true we are passing rapidly to the eternal world, but we owe duties to our community and to coming generations. We should endeavor to establish, in the hearts of our fellow citizens an ardent love for our national home, and to transmit to other ages our beloved country, in its freedom and its fame, improved and embellished by all that speaks to the fine sensibilities of the soul. We should extend and perpetuate, not only those institutions which purify and regenerate, but also those arts which dignify and adorn, human nature. So will this and future generations bless our memory, and entertain a deep and practical regard for the land of the good and the great in science and religion, and of the elegant, the graceful, the sublime in taste and genius. The fame of artists and of authors makes a part of the nation's glory; and genius, and learning, and moral worth, when directed to the good of mankind, will be immortal. We cannot, then, but do a noble deed for ourselves and our country, by giving the moral influence, so imperfectly described, its broadest scope, and rendering it still more valuable and certain, by making the arts the means, not only of elegant amusement, but also of sound and useful education, through their exercise of lawful powers and passions, and their exhibition of virtuous scenes and subjects.

THIRD ANNUAL REPORT OF THE NEW-YORK COLONIZATION SOCIETY.

The board of managers of the Colonization Society of the city of New-York, in presenting their Annual Report, beg leave to congratulate the society upon the success which, by the blessing of Providence, has attended their efforts during the past year; and upon the brighter prospects which are opening to their exertions, notwithstanding the opposition and discouragements they have encountered, and have still to apprehend.

Shortly after the last annual meeting of the society, a proposal was submitted to the Board to unite with the Young Men's Colonization Society of Pennsylvania, in the establishment of a new and model colony upon the coast of Liberia, in furtherance of the general objects of this society, and in execution of its previous determination to that particular effect. A resolution was at the same time transmitted from the former institution, announcing the appointment of its President, the Rev. John Breckenridge, together with Elliot Cresson and Dr. John Bell, as a committee to confer with this board on the subject of the proposed union, and thereupon a committee on behalf of the board, consisting of the President of this society, the Rev. Cyrus Mason, and Anson G. Phelps, was appointed to treat with the committee of the Pennsylvania society, and conclude upon the terms of future co-operation.

The basis of an agreement was arranged by these committees of conference, and subsequently approved of by the board, whereby it was declared,

1. That a union between the two societies ought without delay to be formed.

2. That the basis of the union should be laid in a co-ordinate action of the two institutions, through their respective organs: and that additional conventions or agreements should be entered into when special cases might require them.

3. That the object of the union should be the establishment of a new and model colony on the coast of Africa, on the following principles, viz:—Temperance; dissuasion from war; the promotion of agricultural pursuits; and the other principles embodied in the constitutions of the two societies.

4. That the American Colonization Society, to which these institutions stand in relation of auxiliaries, should not be abandoned, but that every thing should be done consistently with the primary object of the union, toward aiding the parent society.

5. That the new colony should be located at Bassa Cove, provided Governor Pinney should approve of that location,—and if not, at such other place as should be agreed on.

6. That the name of the colony should be fixed upon thereafter.

7. That each society should immediately appoint an efficient agent.

8. That the Pennsylvania society should go on to redeem its pledge in relation to the slaves of the late Dr. Aylett Hawes of Virginia, in expectation of the aid of this society in their removal to Africa.

At the time this report of the committee of conference was submit-

ted to the board, and before its acceptance, an expedition in the ship Jupiter was fitting out in this port, in pursuance of the permission given by the parent board to this society, 'to establish a new settlement at some suitable location in Liberia, and to expend upon that object the money received under its immediate auspices;' which colony was to be established upon the principles set forth in the address of this society to the public, in February, 1834. For the purpose of making the necessary inquiries and arrangements for the immediate founding of this colony, as contemplated by the board previously to the project of the union with the Pennsylvania society,—Mr. Israel W. Searl, a graduate of Amherst college, was appointed to proceed in the Jupiter, to take charge of the new settlement under the superintendence of the Rev. Mr. Spaulding, who had been previously appointed the principal agent of this society in Africa.

With a view therefore to the contemplated union, Mr. Searl was directed 'to confer with the principal agent, as soon after his arrival in Liberia as possible, on the subject of a suitable location for the proposed colony,' and they were jointly instructed 'to direct their attention to Cape Mount and Bassa Cove, with the view of ascertaining which of the two locations, all things considered, would be preferable for a new colony, in respect both to agriculture and to prospective commercial advantages.' Mr. Searl was 'farther directed to act in concert with Mr. Spaulding in making such other personal surveys and examinations in regard to the soil, climate, and productions of the colonial territory, especially in reference to the prosecution of agricultural labor, as might enable the said agents to furnish correct and useful information to this board as to the best place for the location of a new colony.

The Jupiter sailed from this port on the 21st of June last, with stores, supplies, agricultural implements, and goods for the use of the colony of Liberia, to the value of seven thousand dollars. Among the passengers were, beside Mr. Searl, the Rev. Ezekiel Skinner of Connecticut, a physician as well as a missionary, and Dr. Robert McDowal, a colored man, educated at Edinburgh as a physician, both of whom went out under appointments from the parent board, as colonial physicians. They were accompanied by Mr. Charles H. Webb, a medical student under the care of that board, whose purpose was to complete the study of his profession under the instructions of the physicians of the colony, and afterward to engage there in its practice; and also by Mr. Josiah F. C. Finley, a graduate of Princeton college, who, as well as Mr. Searl, went out as a teacher, under the patronage of the ladies' association of this city. Beside these, Eunice Sharpe, a colored woman, of good education and approved piety from Vermont, proceeded to Liberia in the Jupiter, at the expense of this society and in pursuance of a spontaneous determination to devote herself to the cause of education in Africa.

Subsequently to the departure of the Jupiter, Mr. Thomas S. Clay of Georgia, made a communication to the board relative to certain persons of color at Savannah, whom it had been proposed, previously to the last annual meeting of this society, to send out to the new colony; and the object of Mr. Clay was to ascertain whether this board would co-operate with the Pennsylvania society, in enabling the persons in

question to remove to Liberia. The number and respectability of these people, their peculiar fitness to act as pioneers for the projected settlement, and their anxiety to proceed without delay to Africa, presented a case of so much interest and emergency as to induce this board, without waiting for the reports of its agents in Liberia, to unite at once with the Pennsylvania society in establishing the colony at Bassa Cove, under the agreement made between the committees of conference; and with a view thereto another committee was appointed to raise the sum of money requisite for sending out to Bassa Cove those free people of color at Savannah who proposed emigrating to Africa.

This resolution was communicated, as directed by the committee of conference on the part of this board, to that of the Pennsylvania society; and the former committee was subsequently instructed to proceed to the consummation of the union between the two societies; and was moreover empowered to appoint an efficient agent in pursuance of the mutual agreement to that effect. In execution of this power, a negotiation was recently opened with a reverend gentleman of high character and great experience, whose qualifications for the office are such as to warrant the most sanguine expectations of benefit from his exertions; and although no actual engagement has been concluded, yet from the communications which have passed between them, the board entertains the confident hope of obtaining his immediate and undivided services.

In the interval that occurred between the departure of the Jupiter and the final consummation of the union, between the two auxiliary societies, the board was visited by the Rev. Dr. Laurie, the President, and the Hon. Walter Lowrie, a member of the board of managers of the American Colonization Society, as a committee of that board; and at their request the proposed terms of the agreement between this board and the Pennsylvania society were communicated to them at a special meeting of the board, held for the purpose of conferring with them. At this meeting Mr. Lowrie made a statement of the wants and necessities of the parent board, and requested the assistance of this society in obtaining donations and subscriptions for the use of the society at Washington; whereupon it was '*Resolved*, That the claims of the American Colonization Society upon the patronage and liberality of our fellow citizens at the present crisis presented, in the opinion of the board, an imperious call for prompt and vigorous efforts to raise funds, either by donations or subscriptions of stock, for the liquidation of the debts of the said society.' This board, moreover, warmly recommended the appeal proposed to be made in behalf of the parent society to the friends of the cause in this city and state; and appointed a committee to aid the committee of the parent board in making their collections: which duty was faithfully discharged by the former, to the best of their ability, in regard not only to the gentlemen composing the latter in the first instance, but in regard also to the Rev. Dr. Hawley and Mr. Joseph Gales, sen., also members of the board at Washington, who succeeded the first committee in their mission; and to the entire satisfaction, it is believed, of all of them.

From the favorable nature of the unofficial accounts received by the board with respect to Bassa Cove, and from the urgency of the

claims of those persons who were desirous of emigrating from Georgia, the union with the Young Men's Colonization Society of Pennsylvania was finally consummated by the committee of conference, in pursuance of the directions of the board, without waiting for the report of its agents in Liberia. In addition to the former articles of agreement, it was then stipulated that thirty per centum upon all moneys raised by the two auxiliary societies, should be paid over to the parent board, for its exclusive use; that the name of the new colony should be 'Bassa Cove,' and that particular settlements should be designated by the names of 'New-York,' and 'Pennsylvania,' respectively.

In the meantime the promptest means were requisite to secure the manumission of upward of one hundred slaves under the provisions of the will of the late Dr. Hawes of Virginia, and it therefore became necessary for this board, in preference to all other measures, to cooperate in their removal to Liberia within the time limited for that purpose, and which was shortly to expire. These persons had been transferred to the care of the Pennsylvania society by the parent board at Washington, 'to be sent to Liberia, and supported there by the former in a separate settlement or community, under the superintendence of such agents, and under such local laws and regulations as they might adopt; but that the said community should be considered as a part of the colony of Liberia, and subject in all respects to the general laws of the same;' and upon accepting the transfer and acceding to these conditions, the Pennsylvania society expressly stipulated for the right of making such modifications and reforms of existing laws, as would enable it to give greater encouragement to agriculture, to prohibit the importation, manufacture, or sale of ardent spirits within the new colony, and to adopt an improved plan for supplying the public warehouses, and for the issue by gift or sale of their contents to the colonists and native inhabitants.

These preliminaries having been satisfactorily adjusted, the requisite purchases made of stores, utensils, clothing, and other supplies, the ship Ninus was chartered for the purpose of taking out the new colonists. On board of this vessel were accordingly embarked one hundred and twenty-six colored emigrants, viz: one hundred and nine of the manumitted slaves of Dr. Hawes, among whom were several well versed in various handicraft employments, while the greater part of the remainder were also intelligent; some able to read and write, all possessed of good moral characters, and nearly one half of the females expert seamstresses. In addition to these, the husband of one of them was manumitted by the Rev. Francis Thornton to enable him to accompany his family. Another father of a family, and a young girl whose parents were among the former party, were purchased with the same view, and also proceeded with the expedition; together with fourteen other persons of color, manumitted by the heirs of the late Matthew Page, brother-in-law of Bishop Meade of Virginia, who were sent out by the parent society to the old colony, and whose passages were provided on board of the Ninus out of the funds of the expedition. Beside these persons of color, Mr. Edward Y. Hankinson and his wife went out in the same vessel, with the intention of establishing a manual-labor school in the colony, and for that purpose he was sup-

plied by this board with an ample stock of agricultural implements, and with tools of various descriptions for his workshops.

The Ninus arrived at Liberia on the 8th of last December, and on the next day proceeded to Bassa Cove, which had been previously examined by Governor Pinney, the Rev. Mr. Teage, a Methodist missionary, Doctors Skinner, and M'Dowal, and Messrs. Russwurm and Prout, both experienced settlers of the old colony, who all concurred in giving to that location a decided preference, and in representing the health of the country about it as superior to any other in the vicinity; the expense of settling there less than at any other part of Liberia, and that the certain effect of such a measure would be the destruction of a neighboring slave factory, and thus prevent many hundred of the natives from being sold and exported as slaves. The most favorable and encouraging accounts of this expedition have just been received by the return of the Ninus to Philadelphia. On board of her came passenger a son of one of the native princes in whose dominions the slave trade was formerly carried on, but who has since, through the influence of the civilization introduced by the colonists of Liberia, abandoned that traffic and entrusted his son for education to the Pennsylvania Society.

The cost of this expedition was about eight thousand dollars; viz. two thousand five hundred, for the charter of the vessel, and about five thousand five hundred, for stores and merchandise. Of this sum two thousand one hundred and eighty dollars were obtained from the executors of Dr. Hawes, who, by his will, bequeathed the sum of twenty dollars toward defraying the expenses of the emigration of each of his manumitted slaves. The remainder was raised by the donations and subscriptions of benevolent individuals, principally in Philadelphia, and partially in this city.

From the contributions and exertions of this board on this pressing occasion, it has hitherto been prevented from taking any definitive measure for the removal of the Georgia emigrants—toward the expense of which are, however, applicable a sum of seven hundred and thirty dollars received from Andover in Massachusetts, on condition that every twenty-one dollars thereof should be appropriated to the payment of the passage to Liberia, of one emancipated slave; and a farther sum of twelve hundred dollars collected and contributed by Mr. Clay, in express reference to this purpose. To make up the deficiency, and provide funds for the emigration and settlement, not only of these, but of numerous other slaves in different parts of the Union, not less in the aggregate than eight hundred persons, whose owners have offered to manumit them upon condition of their removal to Liberia, the board determined to send as soon as practicable another expedition to Bassa Cove, and for this purpose to raise the sum of fifteen thousand dollars. The first step toward the execution of this measure was to call a public meeting of the citizens of New-York friendly to the colonization cause; which was accordingly held on the fifteenth of January last, and was respectably and numerously attended.

Among the resolutions adopted by this meeting, was one declaring that it regarded 'the union and plan of operation agreed upon between the Colonization Society of the city of New-York, and the Young Men's

Colonization Society of Pennsylvania, as an event promising to be highly beneficial to the colonization cause; and cordially recommending it to the approbation and support of all the friends of our colored population.' Another resolution approved 'of the plan of raising fifteen thousand dollars in aid of the objects of this society,' and proposed 'that a subscription should be opened for the purpose;' which was immediately done, and the sum of six hundred and thirty dollars was collected and subscribed before the adjournment of the meeting. But this board has not since been able to procure the balance yet deficient; although the immediate necessities of the new colony, and the strong claims of the people at Savannah, and of those numerous slaves who elsewhere await only the means of emigration to receive their manumission, press heavily upon the board, and impel them to renew the appeal to their fellow citizens, in behalf of these meritorious and suffering individuals, and in furtherance of the measures designed for their relief.

Much of the delay which has occurred in carrying these plans into execution, is doubtless to be ascribed to the persevering opposition which the efforts of this board have encountered from certain persons in the northern and eastern states, who believe or pretend, that the system of colonization is fraught with evil and pernicious consequences to all the people of color in the country, whether held in bondage or emancipated, and whether the latter are induced to emigrate to the land from which they sprang, or prefer remaining in that of their involuntary adoption. In short, that the colonization system 'tends to rivet the chains of the slave, and extends to Africa the vices, but not the benefits of civilization.' Upon these grounds or pretexts the persons in question both in their individual capacities, and collective organization under the name of 'Anti-Slavery' societies, not only counteract the influence and traduce the principles of the American Colonization Society, and impugn the motives in which it originated, but actually if not wilfully, misrepresent its acts, policy, and proceedings, as well as the sentiments and conduct of all who publicly support its objects, or advocate its cause. They indiscriminately condemn every measure that has ever been adopted or suggested in relation to the colony of Liberia, defame the characters of those who from time to time have been engaged in its management and superintendence, exaggerate every error and misfortune which has occurred in its administration or government, and attempt to impeach the evidence they cannot refute, of its beneficial effects and prospective advantages—and all this avowedly, because they deem its prosperity and existence incompatible with their uncompromising and impracticable project for the immediate abolition of slavery in the south.

From the characters and reputation of some of these individuals both for integrity and understanding, it is impossible to doubt their sincerity; while from the language and conduct of the most forward of their associates, it is equally impossible to concede that these are regulated by the precepts of Christian charity, even admitting them to flow from the purest and most unquestionable motives. But whether deluded or designing, the ignorance or recklessness of these persons in regard to rights secured to the several states and their citizens, by the constitution of the Union—their misconception or disregard of

public sentiment, even at the south, with respect to slavery,—their misinformation or wanton misrepresentation of the actual condition and uniform treatment of the whole colored population, without exception or discrimination—their crude and visionary notions in regard to the practicability, and their imperfect views of the actual progress of emancipation—the precipitate and hazardous measures which they urge to promote it, tending to postpone instead of accelerating its accomplishment—and their oversight or contempt of the insuperable local obstacles to the real improvement and social elevation of our free colored population, are circumstances which, in conjunction with the propagation of their doctrines by foreign emissaries—betray if not the foreign origin of their plan, its subservience at least to foreign interests and views. It has indeed been alleged, by one of our own citizens,* to whom we allude 'more in sorrow than in anger,' as a sufficient reason for denouncing the colonization system and its advocates, that 'if various ecclesiastical bodies in our country have recommended it to the patronage of their churches, it is regarded with abhorrence by almost the whole religious community of Great Britain;' yet even this objection seems to have been prompted by these intrusive foreigners, or urged to countenance their presumptuous interference.

But, be the statement his or theirs, and admitting it to be correct; admitting too, that the 'Solemn Protest' bearing the name of the agitator O'Connel, as well as of the exemplary Wilberforce, affords conclusive evidence of the opinions 'of almost the whole religious community of Great Britain,' this board can never acknowledge the competency or authority of persons at best but imperfectly acquainted with the peculiarities and complexity of our political institutions; uninformed, except by mischievous fanatics, of the situation of our colored population; of the actual condition and treatment of those held in slavery; and of the practicability or consequences of their immediate emancipation; this board, we repeat it, can never admit either the competency or the authority of men whose lives and fortunes are not involved in the controversy, and who have no common sympathies with those whose welfare and existence depend on the issue, but are aliens to our country and its institutions; to pronounce their anathemas against 'the doctrines and conduct of the American Colonization Society,'—whatever may be the characters, respectability, or stations of such persons; however distinguished for their wisdom or moderation as British statesmen, for the catholic spirit of their beneficence as British philanthropists, or for their patriotism and loyalty as British subjects.

The board will neither undertake to decide whether the prudence and delicacy of their interference, the courtesy of the terms, or the charitable spirit of their denunciation, are equal to the zeal by which they seem to have been prompted; nor whether that zeal might not have been as reasonably excited by a consideration of the state of the Irish peasantry, or to the consequences of the sudden abolition of slavery in their own colonies. These are questions which this board willingly leaves to the conscientious and deliberate reflection of the surviving parties to the 'Protest;' though it would feel more confident of a reversal of their opinions, could the purified spirit of Wilberforce exercise over them an influence equal in degree, but opposite in character,

* The Hon. William Jay, of Westchester.

to that which operated upon his enfeebled mind when, almost in the article of death, he was induced to sign that instrument.

That the 'Protest' does not speak the sentiments of 'the whole religious community of Great Britain,' is however manifest from a letter already before the public, addressed to the president of this society by Lord Bexley, the president of the British and Foreign Bible society, as well as of the British African Colonization Society, an institution formed under the patronage of the only member of the royal family of England, who has uniformly supported the abolition of slavery in her colonies. But with all our veneration and respect for England, her religion, her literature, and her laws; with all our gratitude and attachment to the land from which we derive our origin, our language, polity, and jurisprudence; with all our sympathy with her philanthropists, and admiration of her benevolent institutions,—let public sentiment in Great Britain be on this subject what it may, it is more important to show, to the satisfaction of our own countrymen, that the aspersions cast on this society, either by the undistinguishing zeal of foreigners, or the less excusable infatuation of our own enthusiasts, are alike undeserved and unjustifiable, and wholly irreconcilable with truth, candor, and Christian charity.

That the colonization in Africa of our free people of color tends to the immediate and essential improvement of their condition; that it is in fact the only method by which they can be raised to political and social equality with the whites, while so far from preventing or retarding the extinction of slavery, it operates directly to promote emancipation, in the most eligible, safe, and certain mode, must be plain to every fair and dispassionate inquirer, who will examine this momentous subject with the patient labor and careful attention its importance demands. It must however be recollected in entering upon the investigation, that the abolition of slavery is not the direct object proposed by the establishment of colonization societies; it is neither embraced in terms by their plan, nor referred to in their constitutions; and to whatever extent it may be encouraged or accomplished by their operations, it is only by incidental, though perhaps, necessary consequence. They regard the subject, as it truly is, one which the constitution of the United States leaves to the sole regulation and control of the several states in which slavery exists, and consequently as one upon which congress cannot legislate, and with which no other power, whether self-created or deriving its authority from the people of the union, or of any other state, is warranted to interfere. 'The exclusive right of each state in which slavery exists, to legislate in regard to its abolition,' is indeed expressly admitted by the constitution of the Anti-Slavery Society itself, which declares that its aim is to 'convince our fellow citizens by arguments addressed to their reason and consciences, that slave-holding is a heinous crime in the sight of God; and that the duty, safety, and best interests of all concerned require its immediate abandonment *without expatriation*:'* while the avowed object of the American Colonization Society and its auxiliaries is merely the removal, and settlement upon the coast of Africa, of free persons of the African race, with their own free consent.

To establish the first of the propositions thus officially promulgated

* *Vide* Constitution of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

by our opponents, no argument need be 'addressed to the reason and consciences,' of many of 'our fellow citizens;'—for no member of this society, or of this community, and comparatively few, it is believed, even among the enlightened slaveholders at the south, require to be 'convinced' of the guilt of voluntarily reducing to bondage, or holding in perpetual servitude, a fellow creature. They deny however that it is a crime in them to retain in subjection to the laws, and to other imperious circumstances, those ignorant and helpless beings who have been cast upon their protection as well as thrown into their power, by no act of their own. The points really at issue, then, arise upon the second of the propositions embodied in the constitution of the immediate abolitionists, taken in connection with its express repugnancy to colonization, or, as it terms it, '*expatriation:*' and these, as they relate to two descriptions of persons, naturally resolve themselves into two questions, viz:—First, whether 'the safety and best interests' of those people of color who have obtained their freedom, will be most certainly and effectually promoted by their continuance in this country, or by their voluntary emigration as colonists;—and secondly, whether the general emancipation of the slaves in the southern states will be more speedily effected by arguments addressed to their owners, by northern men, than by the inducements to manumission afforded by the plan of colonization, in which the north and south are united, in offering the means of removing them, when manumitted, to Africa.

I. With respect to the first question, it will be perceived that, as it is practical in its nature, it can only be determined by experiment; and in order to decide upon the comparative merits of the two systems, both having in view 'the intellectual, moral, and religious improvement of our free colored population,' and differing only with respect to the theatre of their operations, we must be enabled to look at their respective results. It will be perceived, too, that even upon the point of difference there is no necessary incompatibility or inconsistency in their co-existence. Both systems, so far as free persons of color are concerned, may be carried into full operation without the least interference with each other. The colonization society does not contemplate the removal to Africa of the whole mass of our free people of color, but only of such of them as are willing and qualified to emigrate; and the success of their scheme depends mainly on the characters and qualifications of the emigrants. It is the interest therefore, as well as the declared object of this society, to promote the emigration of the most exemplary and intelligent individuals of the colored race; and surely it may safely be left to the judgments of such persons to determine for themselves, whether a greater degree of comfort, welfare, respectability, and happiness may be attained and enjoyed by them in this country, where they are surrounded by a more numerous population of a distinct race and different color, by the great majority of whom they will, so long as slavery endures in any portion of the union, be regarded as an inferior *caste*, and excluded from all equality of social intercourse, even when admitted to an equal participation of political and civil privileges, than in the colony of Liberia, where no such distinctions, prejudice, or degradation can exist, where they will be secure of perfect equality in the enjoyment of all social advantages as well as of political freedom, civil liberty, and religious privileges; and where

every individual among them may prove an effectual missionary for the conversion and civilization of the kindred inhabitants of that vast continent, from whose shores their own ancestors were torn by fraud or violence.

So far indeed as the experiment has proceeded, all these results have been already shown to be attainable; and many of them have actually been realized, notwithstanding the mistakes and disappointments which, though to a less extent than in any similar instance, have attended this first enterprise of the American Colonization Society.—And if all the benevolent expectations of its founders were not immediately accomplished, should they at once have abandoned their purposes in despair, instead of applying proper remedies and correctives to past errors, and effectual checks and preventives to future mistakes, misfortunes, and abuses? Fortunately for humanity, fortunately for the subjects of their beneficence, and happily for Africa, such was not their decision; and the prosperity and increase of the original colony of Monrovia, and its dependencies, the reforms that have been introduced in its administration and government, as well as the multiplication of new settlements within the limits of Liberia, upon improved principles, under better regulations and more favorable auspices, have already been the rewards of their perseverance.

But if the design and expectations of this society should not be fulfilled; if a single emigrant sent to Liberia should be disappointed in his hopes, become dissatisfied, and conclude that it would have been better for him to have remained in this country, it is always in his power to return: for as his own consent was necessary to his removal, nothing more is requisite to enable him to leave the colony, but the mere expense of the homeward passage, which if his own industry should be insufficient to supply, it cannot be presumed that the benevolence of his more fortunate associates, or of his new found patrons, would withhold. Upon his arrival here he would at all events be a fit subject for the patronage of those who 'aim to elevate the character and condition of our free people of color, by encouraging their intellectual, moral, and religious improvement, and by removing public prejudice, to enable them, according to their intellectual and moral worth, to share an equality with the whites, of civil and religious privileges.'* All this, as far as practicable, can certainly be effected without any necessary interference with the objects of the Colonization Society,—unless the returned emigrant should be persuaded to give his public sanction to distorted, exaggerated, or unfounded statements with respect to the health, morals, condition, or prospects of the colony, and defame the motives and proceedings of its founders and their agents. Let then the friends of immediate emancipation proceed in the execution of any practical measure for the moral improvement of our colored population, and let them no longer content themselves with accusing the friends of colonization with indifference to that subject; a charge, which if advanced against the society, as a body, must be pronounced to be absurd, as well as groundless, inasmuch as the improvement of the colored race, except as it attended, and was necessarily induced by their removal to Africa, was not the object for which this society was formed:—and if the charge be alleged against its in-

* *Vide* Constitution American Anti-Slavery Society.

dividual members, a mere reference to the number and names of those of them who were members of the state abolition societies, both in this state and Pennsylvania, and who are now actively engaged as trustees of public schools, devoted to the education of free people of color, is sufficient to refute it.

II. The question whether the general emancipation of the slaves would be more speedily effected by arguments addressed to their owners, than in consequence of the means afforded by the Colonization Society of removing them to Africa, and establishing them there, in organized communities, is also, as to the alternative proposed by this society, practical in its nature. And if upon this point there appear any collision or repugnancy between the respective objects of the anti-slavery and colonization societies, it can only arise from the implied denunciation and declaration of hostility against the latter, contained in the constitution of the former; and from the positive tendency and effect of the measures it proposes, to defeat not only the design of colonization, but even its own purpose of immediate abolition. Already have the jealousies of the south been rekindled by what they consider a presumptuous and wanton interference with their political rights and personal security, on the part of officious strangers ignorant alike of their position and of their opinions. The avowal of immediate abolition as their object was indeed calculated to excite apprehension, as it could scarcely have been possible that such a purpose could be hoped, even by those who avowed it, to be suddenly accomplished by means of arguments and persuasion addressed to the owners of slaves; but rather through such as might be addressed to the slaves themselves; and accordingly the proceedings and publications of modern abolitionists, instead of producing even gradual conviction upon the minds of the former, of the sinfulness of slavery, or leading to improvement in the condition and treatment of the latter, have but provoked resentment and excited alarm in the bosoms of the masters, and occasioned severer restraints upon the physical comforts and moral and religious instruction of the slaves.

But this is not all: the doctrines avowed by the immediate abolitionists, although countenanced only by an insignificant portion of our northern population, have revived in the south a universal distrust of the professions, sentiments, acts, and designs of all northern men and northern institutions, in reference to slavery; and have consequently embarrassed and impeded the operations of the Colonization Society; not indeed in the mode or on the grounds intended by the abolitionists, but in a manner and for reasons directly opposite in their nature, but to an extent and degree which would nevertheless afford to these enemies of colonization ample room for exultation, were it not that this very circumstance disproves the design imputed to the south, of encouraging colonization, from its tendency to perpetuate slavery.

Were it not indeed for those untoward consequences of the anti-slavery doctrines and proceedings, the friends of colonization might well be content to yield the field of argument and speculation to their adversaries, and silently and resolutely pursue that course of practical measures which obviate at least one formidable impediment to emancipation, by offering to the conscientious possessor of a slave the opportunity of divesting himself of what is imposed on him as property,

frequently by the operation of law alone. It offers to him the means not only of relieving his conscience of a burden, but of removing a weight or an opprobrium cast upon him, perhaps as an inheritance, and which he willingly sustains no longer than the law allows, and humanity permits;—no longer than until he can bestow freedom without rendering it a greater curse than slavery itself. The institution of the parent society by the co-operation of citizens from all parts of the union, of whom many were distinguished for patriotism and intelligence, for prudence and discretion, as well as philanthropy and piety, was hailed as a discovery of the happy means of uniting the north and south in one grand enterprise of national benevolence. Beside promoting an intercourse which might remove jealousies and prejudice, and beget mutual confidence and esteem,—the direct object proposed was the colonization of free people of color upon the shores of Africa, with their own voluntary consent. And although the motives of different individuals for concurring in the scheme were doubtless various, yet the general views of a large majority of its founders were directed not only to the improvement of the moral and physical condition of the free people of color, and embraced through their instrumentality the regeneration of Africa, but comprehended the gradual extinction of slavery as a necessary result. The founders of the American Colonization Society were convinced that without the consent and co-operation of the south, not a step could be taken which led to abolition; and that without the aid and contributions of the north, no funds or resources could be provided either for the removal of such persons of color as might be disposed to emigrate, or to give effect to the intentions of those proprietors who might be disposed to manumit their slaves: while of those founders of the institution who might have originally contemplated the abolition of slavery as the eventual consequence of the colonization system, none probably were of opinion that even if that end could be effected by any method which did not like this insure the preparation necessary for the enjoyment of freedom, it would prove neither advantageous to the slave, safe for his master, nor consistent with the spirit of rational and discreet humanity.

They well know that among the southern proprietors there were many individuals who from principles of policy were anxious for the entire abolition of slavery, but were prevented from manumitting their own slaves, not merely by the laws prohibiting it except on condition of removal, but also by those higher scruples and considerations of duty which forbade the abandonment to their own discretion and control those who from ignorance, infirmity, or vice, needed more powerful restraints and protection than any which the laws afford them. Proprietors of this description would, it was supposed, be encouraged by the colonization system in their benevolent purposes of manumitting such of their slaves as were capable of using their freedom for their own benefit; and of preparing for freedom such of them as might otherwise abuse it to their own injury, as well as to the detriment of society,—by giving them such instruction as would fit them for its enjoyment; while those who regard their slaves merely as property would be led by the influence of example, and from a perception of the enhanced profits to be derived from free labor, to adopt from motives of policy and interest the same measure which others had pursued from principle and feeling.

That these hopes and expectations of the founders of the American Colonization Society were not fallacious, is evident from the number and character of the slaves who have already been manumitted, and of those who await emancipation solely from the operation of the colonization system. It is also manifest from the rapid increase of free labor in some of the southern and western states; and it is proved beyond a doubt by the actual adoption of a law for the gradual abolition of slavery, founded upon African colonization, in one of those states, and the prospect of that example being speedily followed by the legislatures of at least two of the others. Another conclusive proof of the direct tendency of colonization to extinguish slavery, arises from the fact of the larger portion of the emigrants to Liberia having been manumitted that they might become colonists; and if any farther testimony be required, it is afforded by the offer of this society to receive, and in the circumstance of its having actually received and appropriated to that object large donations of money, upon the express condition of applying them exclusively to the removal of manumitted slaves.

But it is objected that the system of colonization, admitting it to be beneficial, is necessarily too limited in its objects, and too tardy in its operations, to prove effectual as a remedy for the evils, or as an instrument for the extirpation of slavery. This objection, although professing to admit, merely for the sake of argument, the beneficent character of the enterprise, yet in effect unavoidably and unwittingly concedes the point. Were it however substantially founded, it might the more easily be removed if those who urge it would but co-operate in the attempt; for we can imagine no impenetrable barrier or insuperable obstacle to restrict the efficiency of colonization, except such as arises from the want of pecuniary means to obviate or overcome them; and these means would of course be readily available if our adversaries would but contribute to them a tithe of the sums which they lavish in creating difficulties and erecting impediments to our success. It was never indeed contemplated by the founders of the scheme to colonize the whole of our free colored population, much less to remove from this country all who are now in bondage. It will be well if means be found to insure the emancipation and removal annually of a number equal to the present annual increase of the slave population, or even of all whose freedom may be obtained upon the condition of their removal. But whether the number of those who emigrate be greater or less, in proportion at all events to that number must be the benefits derived from the colonization system. And surely none but those who avowedly prefer that every slave that now exists, or hereafter may be born on this continent, should remain in bondage, rather than obtain freedom at the price of removing to the land of his origin; none but those who, with the example and history of their own country's settlement before them, assert that 'Colonization extends to Africa the vices, but not the benefits of civilization;' none but such hardy objectors will insist that nothing should be essayed, because every thing cannot be accomplished; that not a single slave should be liberated, because all cannot be set free at once. Time and experience are alone requisite to convince those who are not wilfully blind, that this objection is as futile as it is unfounded; and time and experience alone can determine whe-

ther the plan of colonization, or the means proposed by its opponents, are the best adapted 'to improve the intellectual, moral, and religious condition' of the colored race; and whether the former in its effects and consequences does not promote the abolition of slavery more certainly and securely, and even more speedily, than the direct efforts of the immediate abolitionists.

This board however will by no means intermit their exertions or relax in their perseverance until these questions can be determined. Their past experience is sufficient to confirm and strengthen their original confidence in the wisdom, beneficence, and practicability of their enterprise; and they will resolutely continue to pursue it through good report and through evil report, without being overawed or tempted to deviate from their avowed and legitimate purpose of removing to the shores of Africa such free persons of color as are willing to emigrate, and are worthy to become colonists of Liberia: and if under Providence this society should be instrumental in carrying Christianity and its attendant blessings into that boundless waste of heathenism, which extends beyond the field of their immediate efforts, the board of managers will consider themselves overpaid for all the labor, anxiety, and reproach they have endured, and for all they may be called on to sustain. And in conclusion they would ask, What directly meditated purpose can be imagined more exalted or more hallowed than this merely incidental consequence of the colonization enterprise? Instead of extending 'to Africa the vices but not the benefits of civilization,' it has already accomplished almost literally the reverse; and if it has not sent forth the blessings, wholly unalloyed by the vices, of cultivated life, it is because they are to a certain degree inseparable from each other. The essential advantages of civilization have nevertheless been imparted to Liberia, while its inherent evils have been restrained and mitigated. Ample testimony moreover is at hand to vindicate the character of the colony, and to prove that as a moral and religious community it is excelled by few, perhaps by none, on the American continent, or in the British isles. Not only have the lights of Gospel truth, of education, and virtuous knowledge, as well as of practical science, and the useful arts, been enkindled in these infant settlements, but they have gone forth among the heathen who surround them. The hall of justice and the seminary of learning have been reared, and the Christian temple already lifts its spire to heaven. Already have the heralds of the cross borne sacred fire from its altar into the dark regions beyond the desert; and ere long 'Ethiopia shall stretch forth her hand,' and the 'heads of her princes' be illumined by the lambent flame, which as it enlightens, purifies, and as it expands the heart and mind to the love and contemplation of the ever-living God, warms the whole man to sympathy and charity with every tribe and individual of his kind.

All which is respectfully submitted.

W. A. Duer, *President.*

Ira B. Underhill, *Rec. Sec'y.*

New-York, May 11, 1835.

For the Methodist Magazine and Quarterly Review.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

[The following must end this controversy in this periodical, so long as the present editor has it under his control. And we think our readers will perceive in this, as well as in the one to which it is an answer, good reasons for declining the discussion of this question in the columns of the Christian Advocate and Journal.—Editor.]

Mr. Editor,—In the communication of Rev. La Roy Sunderland, published in your last number, in vindication of his former 'Essay on Theological Education,' against the 'Brief Strictures' which I had made in a previous number of the Magazine, there is so much of personality, that but for the interest I feel in the cause of 'education and intelligence,' and the righteous zeal against 'theological seminaries' in the *Methodist Episcopal Church*, which I rejoice to feel, and which I regard a *sacred duty* to exhibit on all suitable occasions;—but for this I should not condescend to notice the author by the present rejoinder. And I feel that even now I shall not be able to measure swords with him in this mode of warfare, nor do I find it in my heart to 'render railing for railing,' but would rather 'leave him alone in his glory.' The severities of my 'Strictures,' of which La Roy Sunderland complains, as every one of our readers knows, were directed *only* at the sentiments, doctrines, and tendency of the essay of this junior preacher, while to his person or ministerial character I offered no indignity, and to his motives I awarded a measure of approval, and even praise, for which I have been censured by many of the most literary and best educated men in the Church; several of whom have written me in remonstrance against the 'unjustifiable lenity' with which I treated the author of an 'essay' so utterly at variance with Methodism and Christianity, as I have attempted to prove this to be. But it is true, notwithstanding my forbearance toward him, which he fails to appreciate, that there are severities in the 'strictures' against mistakes, and heresies, such as those of which I have convicted the essay, under which 'none but the galled jade will wince.' *Qui capit, ille facit*, is the test by which it may be 'known and read of all men,' whether La Roy Sunderland has or has not 'plead for theological schools' in the 'objectionable sense,' or in any sense: and to the readers of the Magazine it will now be apparent, that it is to the truth of my allegations against the essay that I am indebted for the personal sneering at my humble *name*, and even the professional *title* I bear, which La Roy Sunderland has introduced with so sickening repetition.

It is not a little remarkable how this 'junior preacher,' in a paper on '*Theological Education*,' has contrived to introduce into his first paragraph the *very relevant* topics of '*brick bats, prisons, Irishmen, popery;*' and last, though not least, '*anti-slavery!*' and this fact may serve to indicate the perturbation into which La Roy Sunderland has been thrown by the 'brick bat thrown at his head' in the shape of my 'brief strictures' on his essay. And any one who has read my paper with common candor will, I am sure, acquit me of having used one single expression which savors of the acrimony and censoriousness

which characterize his reply, or a solitary word of that personality with which he has assailed my humble name. No less than sixteen times does he repeat my name in half as many pages, and sometimes twice or more in the same paragraph, and always with a sneer of sarcasm, as though he thought this an exhibition of that 'candor' and 'Christian courtesy' which he so highly commends. Had I treated La Roy Sunderland thus in my 'strictures,' he would have had just ground for complaint, and some pretext for retaliation.

But the question between us is not whether La Roy Sunderland or I be the abler controversialist; nor whether 'theological seminaries' ought or ought not to be appended to our ecclesiastical system;—for this last question is precluded from the Magazine by the decision of its editor;—but the question is simply, whether the kind of *theological education* for which his essay contends, be consistent with Methodism as such, and whether the doctrines of his paper are or are not enforced by unfounded assertions, and heretical or antichristian sentiments. And it is obvious that this question is not to be settled by the enumeration of distinguished names, who 'heard it read,' either before or after its publication. For although the reference to the respected brethren he names may for the most part be authorized by them all,* yet this would only prove that they agreed with him in sentiment, but would prove nothing in relation to the question at issue. It will be necessary however that I should first show that La Roy Sunderland in his 'Essay' upon which my strictures were founded, did 'plead' for 'theological schools,' which he denies 'having *intended* to do.' To settle this question the following extracts from his Essay are submitted to the reader:—

After referring to ancient and modern theological schools, he says, 'The Wesleys themselves were trained and educated for this sacred work in the *very way of which we have been speaking*.' 'They were educated *for* the ministry, and so also was Fletcher, and Dickenson, and Benson;' and 'Fletcher himself was once the *president of a theological seminary*, at the same time he was a *Methodist*, and in good faith and fellowship with Wesley and his people.' 'Efforts are now in operation for the establishment of a *theological seminary* in England, by the *Wesleyan Methodists* of that country.' 'The idea of *theological seminaries among the Methodists* is not something new, as many suppose, and their establishment *would not be an innovation* on the original plan of Wesley.'

The foregoing are a few of the evidences which the 'Essay' affords that La Roy Sunderland did 'plead for theological schools,' whether he '*intended*' to do so or not. And the reader may judge whether a brick bat was hurled at his head '*merely* for advocating the cause of education and intelligence,' as he pretends.

But as the 'junior preacher' now distinctly affirms that he did not *intend* to 'contend for a theological seminary of any kind,' and that all the foregoing extracts 'concerning theological seminaries are said

* One of the gentlemen referred to, Rev. President Durbin, as is admitted in the Essay itself, rejected it when offered to him for publication in the Advocate while he was the senior editor of that paper, whether on account of the 'heresies' it contained, or, as is alleged, because of the question not having been yet opened for discussion in that paper, I have no means of deciding.

incidentally,' and for the mere purpose of '*illustration*,' we need no farther controversy on that subject, but I will only admonish this 'junior preacher,' that when he next writes an 'essay' on any subject, he had better only *say* what he *intends*, and he will have no necessity afterward of announcing that he did not *intend* what he *says*. I expressly provided this *loop hole* for him in my Strictures, when I said, 'It is no vindication to say that the author *did not mean* to go so far,—it is sufficient for me to prove that *his Essay does*.'

This retraction of the most objectionable feature of the Essay is accompanied by a number of desultory and incoherent complaints against my Strictures, which call for a passing notice. The following disclaimer of the sentiment that '*men may be made ministers the same as men are made merchants and mechanics*,' is altogether uncalled for, since this italicised sentence, though craftily accompanied with quotation marks, to give the impression that it is my language, is not found in the 'Strictures.' And yet after pretending to quote it from me, La Roy Sunderland exclaims:—

'Such a thought never entered my heart till I *found it* in the Strictures of D. M. Reese, M. D. I never said this. I never wrote it. I never said nor wrote any thing which by any honest rules of interpreting another's language, could be made to imply this! Never!' Now he certainly never 'found it' in the 'Strictures,' for *it is not there!* Every reader of my paper will see that I charge him with 'depreciating the holy office of the ministry to the standard of a mere secular calling;' and what is said about a 'merchant and mechanic,' is in a quotation *verbatim et literatim* from his Essay. The 'fairness, candor, and Christian courtesy' of this 'junior preacher' here are only a demonstration of the old truth, that '*the wicked flee when no man pursueth!*' That charge may have been made in some *other* of the public rebukes which the Methodist press* of this country has given to the author of the Essay, which in his 'confusion worse confounded,' he dreamed was in the 'Strictures.'

Again: La Roy Sunderland charges that I hold him responsible for the use he has made of the scissors in the consecutive extract of five octavo pages which he has made from Dr. Porter, and hence charges me with a 'mistake.' The correction of this 'mistake' is easy, as every reader knows; for after three sentences from Dr. Porter, which the author of the Essay now objects to acknowledge, I give the following, in his own words, as a proof that he goes the whole with Dr. P.: 'These are just such views as I would to God were engraven upon the heart of every member of the Methodist Episcopal Church.' Are these 'his own words, or the words of another?' Where then is the 'mistake?'

But if La Roy Sunderland is seeking for 'mistakes,' he may find them at home in abundance. For example, he says that in proof of one of his positions he referred to the Bible, and quoted chapter and verse, and that 'I waive all reference' to the Bible, which every reader knows is untrue, since this expression is used in reference 'to the

* By a correspondent in the Western Christian Advocate, as well as in the Western Methodist, the Pittsburgh Conference Journal, and the Methodist Christian Sentinel, La Roy Sunderland may see how his 'Essay' and my 'Strictures' are estimated.

forced analogy he attempts between the schools of the prophets and theological seminaries,' and not to the Bible. And again, it is to this same unauthorized analogy I refer, when I say it is 'too puerile to need refutation,' and not of 'Dr. Goodwin and Richard Watson,' as he alleges. But these are only examples of his 'honest rules of interpreting another's language.' The taunting sneer of the author, in professing to *wait* till I 'have read ecclesiastical history and the works' he names, entitles him only to my contempt.

Once more: La Roy Sunderland complains that I attempt to show that he said that Wesley was not called of God to preach. I made no attempt of this kind, unless quoting his own words does so. I proved that if Mr. Wesley was 'made a minister in the very way precisely in which education societies make ministers,' that he was not a minister after the conclusion of the process for several years, in his own estimation, nor had there, until then, been any 'Divine agency' in the case. This every reader fully understands, and I forbear to repeat the evidence which he so ingeniously evades.

But one more example of the 'honest interpretation' and candor of La Roy Sunderland is found in his taking an extract from the fourth page of my 'Strictures,' on the subject of the 'scholastic divinity of ancient and modern schools,' such as those he names, and a *pretended* quotation from the fifth page, in which I say of 'men-made ministers' whom I describe, that 'among those who glory in their theological training, instead of the cross of Christ,' there are found idlers and drones, who are a curse to the Church, &c. Now, between these two sentences there is no more proximity or connection, locally or sentimentally, than there is between his essay and mine, and yet La Roy Sunderland places the one before the other, with the declaration that the latter is written before the writer 'stops to take breath,' and what is an act still worse than this deception itself, his quotation is *false*.—I give it as he falsely quotes it.

'*These very persons*'—observe, these very persons whom he acknowledges have had 'inferior learning and extraordinary qualifications'—'have been drones, &c.' Now the words italicised are not in the Strictures, and any reader will perceive that the commentary inserted in his ellipsis is *therefore* utterly unfounded. Those of whom I pronounce this judgment are described in the following words, immediately preceding the sentence which he perverts and garbles:—'Young men who are unfit for any and every other occupation, or have fallen through in some more appropriate vocation, have been "trained" for the ministry, and having acquired the "*indispensable* prerequisite," have been proclaimed as competent ministers, to the exclusion of their less learned, but more evangelical brethren; and Christian Churches in our land by hundreds are now groaning under the burden of these *men-made* ministers,' &c. These are the persons of whom the opinion is expressed which is most cruelly appropriated to men of 'superior learning and extraordinary qualifications,' by the dismembering above mentioned, and I blush for the author of so heinous an offence, for which I have no name sufficiently abhorrent. As respects the charge that I contradict Richard Watson and the Wesleyan Magazine on the subject of Mr. Wesley's 'seminary for laborers,' every reader knows that I confirm all that they have said, and demonstrate that neither

that nor the British institution would meet with opposition any where, it being entirely unexceptionable, and strictly Methodistical and evangelical.

But I should extend my rejoinder too much if I were to particularize the instances of similar perversion, or enumerate the examples of *quotations* from my Strictures, and others from his own Essay, which *are not in either of them.* And I will only invite the attention of the reader to the heaviest charge La Roy Sunderland brings against me, viz. that of 'leaving out of my quotation,' '*for the purpose* of changing the sense.' And what is the omission complained of? It is this, that in quoting a single sentence, complete in itself, for the purpose of criticising its sentiment, I did not add thereto the whole paragraph and a subsequent one! He might with as much propriety complain that I did not copy his whole essay including Dr. Porter's five octavo pages, and other fruits of the *scissors*, with which instrument of composition he is so singularly skilled.

But I forbear to pursue this 'junior preacher' any farther, even in self vindication. If he *did* plead for theological seminaries in our Church, and if he *did* maintain all the erroneous sentiments attributed to him, surely he must now be excused on the plea of *juvenility*, or *puerility*, for he assures us he never '*intended* it! No never!' Indeed I rejoice to find that he has entirely retracted the doctrines of the Essay, as I understood them, and as I know them to have been understood, by many of the best educated men in the Church, in the north and in the south, in the east and in the west. And as he now protests that he did not *intend* to inculcate the anti-methodistical and anti-christian heresies, of which I have convicted his Essay, we must all accept of his 'second edition,' and can only lament that his 'literary and theological training' did not qualify him to express his sentiments in language less unfortunate and ill chosen, that he might have been spared the chastening under which he now writhes with so violent contortion. Let him be 'patient in tribulation,' and it will 'work experience,' which is the best teacher. I take my leave of him therefore and the subject too, for I should never have written my 'Strictures' on his Essay, had I suspected that he did not *mean* what he *said.* My 'zeal against theological seminaries,' in the Methodist Episcopal Church, however it may meet with sneers from his 'Christian courtesy,' will prompt me to reply to any man who advocates them, if his plea is published in any of the acknowledged periodicals of Methodism.

Finally, in vindication of the reverend editor of the Magazine I would only add that La Roy Sunderland 'calculates without his host' when he 'considers the admission of my Strictures as an evidence of the editor's willingness to have every thing said by those *opposed to* HIS *views* on the subject of *theological seminaries.*' No one knows better the views of the editor on this subject than myself, nor *am I opposed* to his views on this point, as they have been fully and repeatedly expressed by himself. We differ in opinion on the subject of La Roy Sunderland's Essay, as the 'caveats and disclaimers' accompanying the 'Strictures' demonstrate, but the junior preacher will cease his glorying when he learns that my paper was published along with all the caveats and disclaimers with a mutual understanding, and that I did not scruple to send out my 'Strictures' surrounded on every side

by an editorial vindication of the author of the Essay, and the drawbacks on the plea of 'misapprehension and severity.' I had no motive but to correct error and elicit truth, and with the convictions of duty and sense of responsibility under which I write for the press, had the whole array of great names to whom he refers been marshalled with him in solid column, I should not have shrunk from the fearless and conscientious performance of my duty. And upon a review of my 'Strictures' and all the garbling and misrepresentation of which I now complain, together with the personalities to which I have been subjected, from the author of the Essay, I cannot regret a single step I have taken, a single criticism I have made. 'What I have written, I have written.'

If our controversy shall prevent the future agitation of the question, and should the epitaph be written for theological seminaries among the Methodists, I shall rejoice to have contributed in any way to a burial, from which I pray there may never be a resurrection.

DAVID M. REESE.

From the Salem (Massachusetts) Landmark.

GEOLOGY.

MR. SILLIMAN commenced his fourth lecture on Friday evening of last week, with some additional remarks on trap rocks. He said the difficulty in regard to their formation might be explained by the supposition that they had been protruded from the bottom of the ocean. In the first chapter of Genesis it is stated that the earth was once a liquid mass: *The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters;* and at a subsequent period the dry land is said to have appeared.—Aside from the authority of Scripture, the geologist, from a simple examination of the appearances of the earth, would infer that it had been submerged; or in other words, that there had been a deluge. Had not the trap rocks been melted under an enormous superincumbent pressure like that of the ocean, they would exhibit a very different appearance from their present one; their surface would have been inflated, intumescent, and scoriated.

Marked changes are produced by the trap on the rocks through which it passes. It turns coal into coke or charcoal; it crystalizes sulphur; and turns clay sandstone into brick or jasper. The lecturer described columns of this rock, which are about two miles from the city of Hartford, Connecticut. These columns rest on sandstone; at the junction they are inflated just as their whole surface would have been, had they not been melted under water. Mr. Silliman said it was impossible to explain the facts connected with the trap rock, but on the principle of fire that had once rendered it liquid.

He then proceeded to the history of the granite, the fundamental rock of the globe. With Broigniart's map he exhibited the different layers of rock as they exist in the crust of the earth. He illustrated the difference between stratified and unstratified rocks by reference to two loaves of bread, the one being cut into slices representing the stratified, and the other not cut representing the unstratified rocks.—The origin of this is from fire and water. It was water that made the

layers. There were mechanical and chemical influences in these formations. There was crystalization, which is the result of cohesion from chemical solution. Some of the rocks were entirely subject to the chemical process; others to the mechanical; and others still to the two powers combined.

Granite is made up of three substances, viz. quartz, consisting of silex, one of the most imperishable things in our world; felspar, not quite so hard as quartz, and composed of two-thirds silex, and the remainder alumine and alkali. Felspar is found in great abundance in Chester, Pennsylvania, and is manufactured into porcelain. The third substance entering into the formation of granite, is mica, or ising-glass, unlike all other minerals, in being perfectly elastic. Of the three substances constituting granite, quartz is gray, felspar white, and mica black.

The ancients were well acquainted with granite. Pompey's Pillar and Cleopatra's Needle were made of red granite. To determine whether a bed of granite will be durable for use, it is only necessary to see whether it has endured the effects of time. If it has not been decomposed where it has been exposed to the action of the weather, then it may be concluded it will prove good for building. The Quincy quarry is Sienite granite. When mica is wanting in granite it is called Sienite.

The position of granite is below all other rocks, though it occasionally rises above them all. Mount Blanc, Mount Washington, and the Rocky Mountains are granite. This rock is entirely crystalized. It is sometimes the surface rock, as any rock may be.

No animal or vegetable remains are found in the granite, trap, serpentine, porphyry, or soapstone rocks. Hence they are called primitive, as they are believed to have been formed before there were any animals or vegetables. To the granite family belong gniess and mica slate. Gniess is an admirable rock for architecture, various in its appearance, lying next to granite, and the first that is stratified. Mica slate is of the form of the leaves of a book, and is easily split, and is destitute of felspar. In this rock are found gems known by the names of beryl and garnet. Granite, gneiss, and mica-slate are the foundation of the world. Most of the rocks in New-England belong to the granite family.

Upon these are piled the common slate, of which the best for use should be distinguished by thinness, firmness, smoothness, and the absence of foreign minerals. The best common slate is from Wales.—There is also the chloride slate, the hornblend slate, the hone slate, and the talcose slate, which is soft and easily broken; and there is also the magnesia slate which some famishing inhabitants of savage countries are said to eat. Iron is found in the slate at Williamsburgh in this state.

On closing his description of the slate, Mr. Silliman said he had gone through with the history of the primitive rocks, so called, because they are presumed to have been formed anterior to the other rocks.—As to the theory of their formation, he said that fire had had the principal agency, that geologists considered them as the undoubted product of fire; though the slaty and crystalized rocks should be regarded as the joint production of fire and water.

A part of the primary series is the statuary marble, or primary limestone, which is most beautifully deposited in New-England, especially in Lanesborough and Sheffield, though it is very rare in old England. Beds of it are elegantly situated between the strata of gneiss and mica slate. Being in company with the primary rocks it is called primary, though composed of different materials from granite, having calcareous lime, and carbonic acid.

Serpentine rock is so called from having the appearance of the back of a serpent. This rock is applied to cutlery by Mr. Ames of Springfield, in a most beautiful and durable way. It is very different from limestone, though frequently associated with it; it consists of silex and magnesia. In union with this asbestos, a fibrous, incombustible substance, is often found. Asbestos was used by the ancients for the preservation of the ashes of the burned bodies of their departed relatives; and it is likewise used by moderns. It would make excellent dresses for firemen. Verd Antique marble is made up of limestone and serpentine. There is a quarry of this near New-Haven. Soapstone forms beds in mica-slate; it is magnesian, consisting chiefly of talc, and is most valuable for enduring fire. There is a large bed of it in Groton.

In his fifth lecture on Monday evening of this week, Mr. Silliman mentioned that quartz was often crystalized, and was of all sizes; and had doubtless once been soluble; and indeed had been found actually melted. He said there was abundance of porphyritic granite and trap on Cape Ann, as he had ascertained by a ride thither the Saturday before. He advised there should be added to the splendid East India Museum at Salem geological specimens. Porcelain clay was described as made of decomposed felspar.

The Beverly rock the lecturer represented as remarkably interesting. It is near the bridge; it has a basis of sienite, and dikes of trap five feet wide, with veins of felspar and quartz crossing each other; not blended but distinct. It is manifestly the effect of fire.

The professor considered geology the grandest science next after astronomy; the former having one advantage over the latter, in presenting objects that can be handled, and seen with perfect distinctness.

He was aware, he said, that he made a great demand on the confidence of his audience; but he wished them to remember that He who made the world had no limits of time or space; and therefore there need be no trouble about time in the first formation of the globe. He was addressing those who believed in God. If this belief were set aside, he would relinquish all farther examination into the structure of the world, and be for ever silent on every subject of science. The man who disbelieved in God, he regarded not as a rational being, but as a mad man.

He said that quartz frequently formed a rock by itself; there was the granular quartz, which is in grains, and will not crack by heat.—Granite is sometimes cracked, but never stratified. There are masses of decomposed granite and sienite on Cape Ann.

Rocks lying upon granite are stratified. In these are found fossils, which are the remains of plants and animals. The inference is, that there were no animals nor plants in existence when the rocks, having no such remains, were formed, which rocks have already been descri-

bed, and are all more or less crystalized. Fire as well as water effects crystalization; and the process has been seen to go on in volcanoes. It has been objected that lime could not have been ignited, because in that case it would have been turned into quick lime. Sir James Hall, the father of the famous Captain Basil Hall, set aside this objection by actual experiment. He found that marble could be heated in a gun barrel without losing its carbonic acid. A similar experiment, with a similar result, has been performed on trap rock.

Professor Silliman said he had now come to a period in our world where marks of violence were visible. By movement in the water, rough, angular masses of rock are made smooth and round; and these smooth, round substances are found in the interior of continents. The shores of New-Holland are strown with the topaz, a mineral next to the diamond in hardness. The original materials were broken off and deposited by gravity. Thus jasper is discovered cemented by a paste of quartz. Such deposites must have come in after the primary rocks. They are remarkable for their elevations; are found on the Catskill mountains. After being formed, they must have been raised by internal fire. The pudding stone, or the conglomerate, is traced high up the Alps.

The first evidence that the formation of the globe was progressive, is the fact, that down in very deep rocks are fossils, the remains of strange animals, embedded in solid masses. The trilobite, an animal that once swam in the water, may be seen in abundance at Trenton Falls. Almost all animals found in rocks have become extinct. It was the will of our Creator that the earth should be gradually prepared for the animals that were to live upon it. There are traces of fossils even in the pudding stone.

The transition rocks are those which appear to be passing from one state into another. In these are vast numbers of animals now extinct.

The early corals are remarkable. There are the living corals in the seas of all warm climates. In the production of the coral, the animal collects the lime from the ocean. These productions are of every variety of form. The chain coral is found in the interior of our own country. It is found in fields, in mountains, and in rocks; some corals are silex, and some lime. These works of animals are sometimes built up into high mountains. In the southern seas there are reefs of coral a thousand miles long. They are first erected as walls against the wind. The animal never works above the water; he brings up his establishment to the surface and there leaves it; but birds and plants may add to its elevation; still it must have been fire beneath that has raised them to the height which in many instances they have attained.

The professor said there was good reason to believe the bottom of the ocean to be similar to the surface of the earth; and as corals form parts of our mountains, the inference is, that this continent was once under the ocean.

In limestone are vast caverns. The Mammoth Cave, in Kentucky, has been explored to the extent of ten miles without coming to any limits. Subterraneous rivers are also known to exist; and the explosion of gunpowder in a cavern of Derbyshire, England, caused the rushing of a mass of waters through the interior region.

FAVORABLE SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

If there be any one characteristic by which this age is distinguished from another, it is that of *excitement;* and, generally speaking, an excitement on subjects that are intrinsically good. It cannot be expected indeed, as human nature is, that scarcely any excitement, however good may be its objects, or however proper the means which are applied to produce the emotion, should be free from all impurities, exempt from all excesses, or disencumbered from all human infirmities. When we consider the elements of which human society is formed, its liabilities to be moved to action under the influence of impure motives, to be biassed and led into error by rash and precipitate judgments, and imperfect councils, we need not be surprised at finding many excesses to correct, errors to rectify, and numberless infirmities to bear with. The wonder rather is, that, amid so many clashing interests, strengthened as these are by so much selfishness, pride, and obstinacy, there should be no more exhibitions of corrupt passions mingling themselves with, and disturbing the repose of human society.

The mind of man is ever active. And at a time when there is so little of national animosities to call off and to concentrate the energies of one community toward another, by which the minds of men are left at liberty to act upon each other in opposite directions, to scan one another's motives and objects, there is much less of private bickerings, of tumultuous assemblages, and of rough dealing one with another, than we might reasonably expect.

To what is this owing? Doubtless to a moral and religious influence. For some years past, there has been a gradual movement 'upon the face of the waters,' and light, spiritual and intellectual light, at the command of God, has been diffusing itself over the congregated mass of human intellect, so that the dark chaos of human nature has become more and more enlightened, its natural asperities have become softened, and its warlike propensities have been tutored to the principles of peace and good will, so far as to appreciate, in some good degree, the benefits of quietness and harmony among the several members of the human family.

Several causes have operated to produce this effect—all originating primarily from that great first cause of all good, God's great love to mankind, as developed in the Gospel of Jesus Christ. Those who attribute this salutary revolution in the public mind to any one insulated cause, we think greatly err, 'not knowing the Scriptures, nor the power of God' which has most obviously operated through the medium of a variety of causes, themselves the effects of the primary movement set in motion by the Hand that moves the world, to the production of that excitement which is now acting so beneficially on human society.

To the powerful revival and rapid spread of pure religion, which dates its commencement about the year 1730, we may attribute all those benevolent institutions which are now, and have been for several years, blessing the world with their meliorating and saving influences. It is not to the preaching of the Gospel alone, to the institution and active operation of the Bible Societies, to the Missionary Societies, and other kindred institutions—it is not, we say, to any *one* of these philanthropic institutions that we are to attribute the present altered state of the public mind, but to the combined influence of them *all*—they all are so many bright luminaries which God has created, and lit up, and hung out, in the celestial firmament, to give light unto the world—to *rule* the world, until it shall be completely subdued to the obedience of Jesus Christ. The united influence of all these causes, or means of operation, unless impeded in their progress by some untoward occurrence, some strange fatality which ever hangs over the path of man, shall be onward, and onward,—until there shall be no place left, 'either for error in religion, or for viciousness of life.'

We do not wish to deceive ourselves nor be the instruments of deception to others, but we cannot help thinking that the present 'signs of the times' augur favorably to a more general spread of evangelical light and civil liberty, than has ever been witnessed in our world.

1. In the first place the principles of civil liberty and religious toleration are more generally understood and exemplified than at any time heretofore. The history of the world proves that a spirit of civil despotism and religious persecution has always haunted mankind with less or more fury, spreading misery and death over the plains of human society, under the pretence of maintaining the rights of individuals and preserving the purity of the faith and uniformity in the modes of Divine worship. This is a fact so evident to the most casual observer that it needs no proof. It is among the lamentable evidences of human frailty, if not indeed of the entire wickedness of man's heart, that no sooner did one sect, either of pagans or Christians, obtain dominion, than it persecuted all minor sects, inflicting upon them pains and penalties, merely because they would not subject their understandings and consciences to the mandates of the dominant party.

In this respect the times are happily changed for the better. Moral and religious truth has been so far diffused as to banish those dark clouds of error from the intellectual and moral world. With few exceptions, religious toleration, even in pagan countries, is granted to all Christian sects. From the frozen regions of the north to the torrid zone of the south—from the populous regions of the east, where Mohammedan despotism and pagan superstition and idolatry had so long wielded their leaden sceptres, to the barbarous climes of our western wilds—including all the intermediate latitudes and longitudes, with the exception of a few insulated spots which are blighted with the

reign of the 'beast and the false prophet,' the feet of the missionary may tread without obstruction from 'the powers that be,' and his voice may be heard echoing among their hills and valleys to the sound of salvation in the name of Jesus. And in this work he is permitted to bring to his aid all those auxiliary helps which are found in the distribution of the Bible, the circulation of tracts, the establishment of Sabbath schools, the promotion of the temperance cause, and the rearing up all those institutions of learning which always accompany every well-directed effort to save the sinner, and to elevate him to his proper rank in the scale of creation.

This we consider no small achievement. And let this good work go on increasing every year with a ratio equal to that which has distinguished it for some years past, and the spirit of intolerance shall be driven from among men, to have its place only in the infernal regions, where it originated, and where it properly belongs. With this increase and diffusion of religious toleration, the principles of civil liberty, with all their train of attendant blessings, will be more and better understood. Already some of the thrones of despotism, which have long tyrannized over the consciences of mankind, are nodding to their fall; and with them those ecclesiastical hierarchies, which have been interwoven in those civil despotisms, are likely to come to 'a perpetual desolation.' These two 'great lights' of civil liberty and religious tolerance are destined, in the providence of God, to enlighten the world.

2. Another favorable sign appears in the increase of evangelical principles and piety among the several sects of Protestant Christians. Time was, and that not a century since, when the peculiar and distinguished doctrines of the Gospel, such as the new birth, the witness and fruits of the Spirit, holiness of heart and life, the atonement by Jesus Christ, and all those truths and duties growing out of these, were treated either with cold indifference, or total neglect, or with that contempt which is generally poured upon fanatical reveries, and that even by Protestant clergymen themselves. This was not all. Many of the clergy were open violators of God's law, card-players, horse-racers, dancers, and theatre-going men; mingling indeed with all the frivolities of the age. Such was the low state of religion and morals at that period, that those practices were thought by most people to be no disparagement to any one, not even to a clergyman.

This time has happily gone by. Were a clergyman, or even a professor of religion, now to exhibit that laxity in moral conduct which distinguished former times, he would hazard his reputation among all classes of men. But there is not only a reformation in moral conduct, but also a much more important one as regards the essential doctrines of the Gospel. Among all sects of Protestant Christians which are considered orthodox, those doctrines are preached and enforced as of

paramount interest. The necessity of repentance, an abandonment of every sinful course, justification by faith in Jesus Christ, and holiness of heart and life, with all the attendant virtues of Christianity, are urged upon mankind from almost every pulpit in the land, among all sects of orthodox Christians. These things bring a vast concentration of influence to bear down upon error and all sorts of vice, and also give a mighty impetus to the onward march of Gospel truth and holiness.

3. As a necessary effect of this united effort in the cause of evangelical religion is the bringing the several sects of Christians nearer together in their views and feelings, and consequently producing a greater concentration of effort in the common cause. All that is wanting to produce the desirable object is, to induce all those who see alike on those cardinal points, to let minor differences on non-essential points be sunk out of sight, and all unite to defend, illustrate, and enforce, with all the energy which an ardent attachment to the fundamentals of Christianity naturally inspires, on all men the absolute necessity of experimental and practical religion. What could withstand the shock that would be produced by such a united and simultaneous onset upon the kingdom of darkness!

And do not the 'signs of the times' predict this auspicious period as not far distant? It only remains for the evangelical sects to do their duty in order to bring it to pass. Let them cease to oppose each other on non-essential points, and let all minor matters be merged in this one great consideration, the *conversion of the world to Jesus Christ.*

4. Another highly favorable omen is the mighty efforts which are put forth in the grand missionary cause, including Bible, tract, Sunday school, and temperance societies. What a mollifying influence do these efforts have upon the hearts of Christians! And it appears to us that this work must go forward in despite of all the powers of earth and hell. The impression made upon the public mind already, by the combined operation of all these causes, is such as to carry a sort of resistless influence in favor of religion and morals, as well as in behalf of civil and religious liberty. Already these institutions stretch their arms to the four quarters of the globe, while their voices are lifted up on high at every point of the compass, crying in accents of warning and invitation, 'Fear God and give glory to His name, for the hour of His judgment is come.'

In this grand enterprise the whole Christian Church, including almost all sects, are unitedly engaged. And surely before such a mighty phalanx, headed as it is by the God of battles, the strong holds of sin must give away, and soon a universal shout shall go up to Heaven, 'Babylon the great is fallen;' 'the kingdoms of this world have become the kingdoms of God and of His Christ,' and therefore 'He shall reign for ever and ever.'

It is true that wickedness abounds, and that the natural opposition of the corrupt hearts of men to the Gospel manifests itself in a variety of ways. But this is but a fulfilment of the prophecy, that when 'many should run to and fro, and knowledge be increased,' the 'wicked should wax worse and worse, and none of the wicked should understand.' The 'brightness of his coming' always 'reveals the man of sin;' but the *same brightness shall destroy it.* And though the number of the really righteous is comparatively small, yet the declaration that 'one shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight,' assures us that His promise shall be accomplished in due time, 'that all shall know the Lord from the least to the greatest.'

But while we indulge ourselves in this belief, we must remember that this desirable event is to be realized by the instrumentality of human agencies. Those who loiter at their post cannot participate either in the achievement itself or in its rewards. The whole Church therefore must be aroused to a sense of her responsibility in this important matter. The Church indeed is the grand instrument by which the work is to be accomplished. To her is committed the sacred trust of converting the world to Christ. She is the 'light of the world,' the 'salt of the earth.' That the light of the truth may be clearly and widely diffused, all moral impurities must be washed away; otherwise the light shines but dimly, and men are left to grope their way in the dark.

There must also be a waking up to the exercise of faith to this very subject. This faith will lead to correspondent actions, and then, 'according to thy faith' it shall be done. One grand reason why this work does not go on with greater rapidity is, we are not looking, and praying, and believing, for this very thing. We are satisfied with small things, and therefore God gives us small things in exact proportion to our faith. If all Christians were taught to pray for a more mighty outpouring of the Spirit, for a more rapid diffusion of Gospel truth and holiness, who can doubt but that it would soon be witnessed?

In the hope that these few remarks may tend to stir up a spirit of prayer for the conversion of the world, and to excite a vigorous faith in the promises of God which relate to the general extension of the Redeemer's kingdom, they are submitted to the reader. If, instead of disputing about minor matters, all were to engage *heartily*, and *prayerfully*, and *faithfully* in this grand work, using all their strength in the application of those means which God has ordained, we should see greater things than we have ever yet seen. The 'tall sons of Anak' would bow before the Lord, and mighty men of God would be multiplied into a host. And who could stand before this host? Let but the Church be presented before the world 'without spot or wrinkle,' with her armor on, and she shall go forth under her conquering Lord from one conquest unto another, until the 'mountain of the Lord's house shall be established upon the top of the mountains, and all nations shall flow unto it.'



T. Illman sculp.

REV. MANNING FORCE.

PHILADELPHIA CONFERENCE.

B. Waugh & T. Mason, Mulberry St. New York.

THE

METHODIST MAGAZINE,

AND

Quarterly Review.

VOL. XVII, No. 4. OCTOBER, 1835. NEW SERIES—VOL. VI, No. 4.

A SERMON ON THE DIVINITY OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY THE REV. JOHN DEMPSTER.

"Who being the brightness of His glory, and the express image of His person, and upholding all things by the word of His power, when He had by Himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high."—Hebrews i, 3.

THIS epistle to the Hebrews is a masterly production of a masterly mind. It sheds a light on the economy of God in the Jewish Church, which shines from no other source. It develops the deep import of the temple service, much of which would have otherwise remained enigmatical. The first chapter is an appropriate introduction to the whole epistle, and 'for importance of subject, dignity of expression, harmony and energy of language, compression and yet distinction of ideas, it is equal if not superior to any other part of the New Testament.' (*Clarke's Commentary.*) The verse we have chosen for a text may be deemed the most lofty part of this astonishing chapter. It at once presents the *mysterious person* of our Redeemer in His two natures. It gives an elevated description of His *Godhead*, by entitling Him the outbeaming of His Father's glory, the express image of His person, and the upholder of all things by the word of His power. It involves the *necessity* of His *human* nature, by ascribing to Him the purgation of our sins, and assigning to Him a seat at the right hand of the Divine majesty, to which, even in His *human* nature, He had mounted to effectuate, by His intercession, the lofty purposes of His mercy. We have therefore selected this text as an appropriate foundation of the arguments we intend to submit to you, in support of our *Savior's supreme Divinity.*

After a few remarks on the term PERSON, which occurs in the text, and has held a distinguished place in theology, we shall proceed to sustain our position by showing,

I. That the works which are peculiar to Jehovah, are ascribed to Christ.

II. That the worship which belongs only to Jehovah, is rendered to Christ.

III. That the titles which can belong only to Jehovah, are appropriated to Christ.

IV. That the attributes by which the great Creator is known are claimed by the Redeemer.

V. And finally, that the Gospel proceeds on the supposition that Christ possesses supreme Divinity.

All the great truths we have stated in these propositions are suggested by the different parts of the short chapter before us. Immediately before the text, the sublime achievement of erecting the frame of the universe is, in this language, *ascribed to Christ*—'By whom also He made the worlds.' And in another part of the chapter we find the firmest support to our second proposition. The highest worshippers in the heavenly world are called on, by the everlasting Father, to *worship the Son.* When he bringeth in the first begotten into the world, he saith, 'And let all the angels of God *worship Him.*' And in the next verse but one, we find proof of our third proposition, viz. in his paternal address, the Father appropriates to the Son that awful name by which Himself is known: 'Thy *throne, O God,* is for ever and ever.' Here the title *God* is given to the *Son,* by *Him* who alone knows all its mighty import.

The *attributes* that belong to *God* are, by implication, ascribed to Christ, by the text itself: It calls Him 'the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person.' Now the proceeding rays which are here said to shine from the Father, must have the same nature as the fountain from whence they emanate; and as He is said to be the express image of His Father's person, there must be in the one every thing answering to what there is in the other; all the attributes ascribed to the one person must belong to the other, if He be the express image of the former. Finally, our fifth proposition is an inference from the latter clause of the text. For if by Himself He purged our sins, He must have been the *source* of *law* to have thus met its unanswered claims: that is, He must have been *God* to have been capable of *suffering meritoriously* as man. Thus within the narrow limits of this brief chapter all these *adorable perfections* are implicitly or explicitly ascribed to *Christ.*

Before we advance to the designed proof of our position, we shall make a passing remark on the term PERSON, which occurs in the text. This *term* has generally been used to express an individual substance of an intelligent nature; and when so used it implies a *separate* being. Were it so used when applied to the *Father, Son,* and *Spirit,* it would signify *three Gods.* But the Scriptures most explicitly teach, what all Jews and Christians believe, that there is but one GOD; and at the same time they explicitly ascribe ACTS to the *Father, Son,* and *Spirit,* respectively, which characterize *personality.* The term is therefore used by Trinitarians to express *distinct agents,* but not *separate agents,* in the Godhead. From the nature of the case then, the term *person* has not in all respects the same meaning when applied to God, as when applied to *man;* and this, indeed, is true of most other words when applied to express what is *peculiar* to *God.* In the common use of the word we have been accustomed to contemplate *personality* only in connection with *separation* of *being.* But, by proper attention to the subject it will be perceived that separation of being is merely an *accidental* circumstance, usually attendant on personality, but not *necessarily arising* out of *personality.* For 'the circumstance of *separation* forms no part of the idea of personality itself, which is confined to the *capability* of *performing* PERSONAL ACTS.' 'In God the distinct *persons* are represented as having a common *foundation in one being;* but this union also forms no part of the *idea* of *personality,* nor can

be proved inconsistent with it. Considering then neither *union* nor *separation* essential to *personality*, but merely *accidental* to it, the objection which the rejecters of our Lord's Divinity urge against the idea which this term expresses must be powerless. The *distinctness* of *person*, expressed by the pronouns I, THOU, HE, is *essential* to the personal character, as ascribed to the *Trinity*. Thus we find the very frequent occurrence of these terms, both in the addresses of the Father to the Son, and in those of the Son to the Father, and by the pronoun HE our Lord generally speaks of the Holy Spirit. Likewise WE and US are repeatedly used in the Old Testament, when Jehovah speaks of *Himself alone*. In using the term person, then, in this definite sense, no absurdity can be involved in maintaining that God consists in THREE as to PERSONS, and in only ONE as to BEING.* As then no one doubts the existence of the Father, or the unity of the Godhead, should we prove that Christ is the *true God*, we shall have thereby proved that *more* than *one person* exists in *one being*.

We shall now proceed to lay before you some of the evidences and arguments by which we prove,

First, That the works which are peculiar to Jehovah are ascribed to Christ.

That the creation of the heavens and the earth, with all they contain, is claimed in the Old Testament by Jehovah, we need not detain you to prove; for none can have read the Jewish Scriptures without knowing that the supreme God there distinguished Himself from all other beings, by His *claim* to have *created all things* that exist. Now should we find this great claim *asserted* by, and *accorded to Christ*, in the Scriptures, the conclusion will be, what God claims to the exclusion of all else in the universe *belongs to Christ;* and that therefore Christ is God. By adverting to the first chapter of John's Gospel, we will find *the work of creation ascribed to Christ*, in the most express language that could have been employed. 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God; all things were made by Him, and without Him was not any thing made that was made.' Here it is affirmed that the *Word* was in the *beginning*, that it was *with God* in the *beginning*, that *it* was *God*, that all things were *created* by *it; all things*, in the most comprehensive sense, for without the *Word* was not *any thing created* that was made. Now should the term *made* be understood to signify nothing more than

* The question often propounded is, Can three be but one, or can one be three, while it remains still but one? But the question identifies the two different senses, in which the terms *one* and *three* are used; and by doing this, it creates the absurdity which it groundlessly charges on Trinitarians. They use the term *one* to signify a being, and *three*, to signify the MODES in which a *being* exists.—Were these terms so used as to imply THREE *beings* in ONE being, or THREE PERSONS in ONE PERSON, they would state what no rational being could believe; for no one understanding the *terms* could believe that *three* things made but *one* of the *three;* or that *one* thing made *three like itself*, any more than he could believe that the *whole* is *greater* than *all* its parts, or that a *part* is as great as the *whole*. But when *person* is used not to express a *separate Being*, only a *mode* of the Divine existence, it can involve no absurdity to affirm of three *persons* that they are but one *being;* or of *one being*, that he exists in *three* persons. Now this plain *distinction* between a *person* and a *separate being*—between a being that simply has existence, and the *modes* in which it exists, obviates all objections urged on the ground of confounding numbers, and leaves our way unobstructed in which we are to proceed in sustaining the fact thus stated.

arranging and *setting in order* the new dispensation, as the Socinians contend, it convicts the Evangelists of this 'pitiful truism,' that Christ did nothing in establishing His religion which He did not do. But when this passage is taken in connection with several that follow it, how is it conceivable that any can understand it as signifying less than *creating* the *physical* world? For here it is asserted that the world was made by Him; that *very world* into which He came as a 'light;' that *very world* in which He 'was made flesh;' that *same world* which 'received Him not.' Now if it be asserted that the words, 'the world was made by Him,' mean a moral renewal, it must either be maintained that the natural world has been morally renewed by Christ, or that the world, here meaning men, was morally renewed by Christ, and yet did *not receive* Him; either of which would be too absurd to argue against.

Thus these efforts, and the most strenuous that have been made to make the beginning of the Gospel teach any thing but the *supreme Divinity* of Christ, end in the *confusion* of the system they aim to support. But let us view still more narrowly the passage in question.—By this text we understand that *nothing* was *made* but by the *Word*, which was in the beginning with God. This shows it impossible that the '*beginning*' should refer to any later period, than the first moment when the creation began to arise; otherwise the *Word* by whom the creation was made, would have acted *before it existed.* It teaches the Word was never created, for it declares without Him—the *Word*—was nothing made that was made; if, therefore, the Word was created, it *created itself*, that is, it acted before it existed, which is impossible. The text then teaches that the Word is uncreated.

Now as there can be no possible existence between that which *was created*, and Him who *always* existed, to the Word must belong an *unbeginning* existence. Hence the peculiar sense fixed on the expression 'the Word was with God;' with Him as no other being *can be;* with Him in *creative power;* with Him in *uncreated essence;* with Him so as to be God.

But if this passage in John's Gospel ascribes the whole *physical creation* to the power of Christ, and thereby proves him to be the *uncreated* the eternal God, one in the epistle to the Colossians does it no less explicitly—'For by Him were all things created that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers, all things were created by Him, and for Him, and He is before all things, and by Him all things consist,' Col. i, 16–17. In these two verses there are four facts stated of Christ, each one of which could *characterize* none but the *Supreme Being.* 1st. It is affirmed that by Him were all things created that are in heaven and that are on earth. By using nearly the same language adopted by Moses where he informs us that 'God created the heavens and the earth;' the apostle evidently intended to designate *Christ* as the *God* of which *Moses speaks.* Now as it is impossible that *each* of two beings should have created the same heavens and earth, and as Moses ascribes this work to God, and the apostle to Christ, the conclusion is irresistible that *Christ* is *God.* But the apostle is both more *comprehensive* and more *particular* than the historian; Moses ascribes to God in this passage only what is corporeal; the apostle ascribes to Christ *all this*, together with all incorporeal

existences: not only all things visible, but likewise all things invisible, all the hierarchies of the heavenly world; ascending through all the ranks of angelic natures, he showed them to be but *beams* of *Christ's brightness.* Thus in the immense embrace of his expression the apostle includes all worlds and all natures. 2d. But lest the mighty work of giving existence to all that has being should be imputed to power with which Christ was delegated, the apostle assures us that all things were created *for Him;* that He is not only the creator but the proprietor of all worlds. Could He have acted as an instrument, the creation He formed would have belonged to *Him* who employed the instrument—to *Him* who communicated the power to create. But as all things were made *for* Him, He must *always* have been enrobed with creative power, Rom. i, 20. The apostle proceeds to state that He is *before all things;* before all the things that He had created, before all things that were ever created, otherwise He could not have created all things. Had *He* been *created*, the text could not be true, that all the visible and invisible, in heaven and earth, matter and spirit, were created by Him. Nor could it be true that He was *before all things* that were created; for were He a created being, as the rejecters of His Divinity contend, the text would make Him exist before He existed. And this is one of those absurdities in which that class of men is unavoidably involved. But it is added in this passage, that 'by Him do all things *consist.*' Here the same by whom all things were created, the same for whom all things were created, the same who was before all things—is the very same by whom all things consist. By the word of His power the mighty fabric of all worlds is borne up: men and angels, all that has life, live and move in Him.

I know not that in all the Divine records a higher ascription of almighty power is made to the omnipotent God than is here made to Jesus Christ.

As then the whole creation is ascribed to Christ, and as St. Paul informs us, Rom. i, 20, that the eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen in the creation, that eternal power and Godhead must belong to Christ. But if a created being could have made the world, the apostle cannot be correct in stating that it is a standing *proof* of *eternal power and Godhead;* for then it would not show forth the Godhead of the eternal, but merely the powers of the creature.

But not only building and sustaining the creation are ascribed to Christ, but the removal of the material universe is also to be effected by His power. In the first chapter to the Hebrews the Father says to the Son, 'And thou LORD in the beginning laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands: these shall perish, but thou remainest; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed.' Here unbounded power is seen changing, removing, and wrapping together the whole universe of material things, with the same ease and majesty with which it first raised them from nothing, arranged their materials, and sustained the fabric. And all this incommunicable power is, by the mouth of the Father, ascribed to Christ. Now, if God and Christ are not the *same Being*, as Christ is declared the creator of all things, God can have created nothing; as all things were made for Christ, God possesses nothing; as all things

consist by Christ, God upholds nothing. By this system, therefore, the adorable Jehovah is robbed of His whole empire. He can deserve no worship from any being, for He is neither the author, upholder, nor proprietor of any.

But not merely do the great works of making, preserving, and finally removing the material universe, properly belong to Christ; but also such a control of the elements of nature, the power of death, and the spirits of darkness, as prove Him supreme.

That the power of working miracles was His own cannot be doubted when we attend to the facts, that He wrought them in His own name; when He restored to life the widow's son, His language was, 'Young man, *I say* unto thee, Arise;' when He called putrefied Lazarus from the grave, whose *power* did He invoke? whose *name* did He use but His own? 'Lazarus, come forth,' was sufficiently efficacious to raise his corpse from the tomb, and call his spirit from eternity. That this was an original power of His own, appears also from His having bestowed it on His disciples, Luke x, 12, 'Behold I give you power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy, and nothing shall by any means hurt you.' Luke xi, 1, 'And He gave them power and authority over all devils, and to cure diseases.' Thus the power of working miracles He expressly reserves to Himself. '*In my name* shall they cast out devils.' '*His name*, through faith in His name, hath made this man strong.' The prophets wrought stupendous miracles, but they never did attempt them in their *own name*. It was not Moses, but the rod of God, that so controlled the elements of nature. The apostles wrought miracles that blazed through a whole age, but they were *shocked* if any thought of ascribing them to their *own* '*power* or *holiness*.' All the wonder-working men that wrought miracles in any age acted then not as AGENTS, but merely as INSTRUMENTS. Of all the beings that have ever appeared among men, Christ alone has ever *pretended* to work 'the *works* of His *Father*.'

Another act of Christ demonstrative of His Godhead is, His having given the Holy Spirit. 'If I go away I will send the Comforter.'—This is the language of one possessing the original right to send forth the eternal Spirit—to communicate that miracle-working power that wrought all the deeds of a God. It is also said of the Spirit, 'whom the Father shall send;' but Christ claims to do the same: 'The Comforter whom *I will send* unto you.' 'Therefore being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, *He hath shed* forth *this* which ye now see and hear.' Thus the Holy Ghost is called indifferently the Spirit of Christ and the Spirit of God.

The prerogative to FORGIVE SINS, which belonged to Christ, proves Him to be God. A man or angel may be commissioned to announce the principles on which the eternal Sovereign will forgive sin, but no created being can possess the *right* to pardon it. The party offended, alone, can obviously possess the right to pardon the offender; for if 'sin is the transgression of the *law of God*,' He is the object offended. What is it then for a mere *creature to forgive sin*, but to take in his own hands the *rights* of the infinite Jehovah? It is not questioned whether the Supreme Being can reveal to His servants the fact of another's pardon, and they declaratively pronounce that pardon; but this is no

more *authoritatively* granting pardon, than it is to usurp Jehovah's throne. To Him who is the *source* of *law*, which sin violates—the *author* of that government on which it tramples—to *Him alone* it can belong *authoritatively* to *pardon it.* Now, in *this very manner* we find Christ forgiving sin. He said to the sick of the palsy, 'Son, be of good cheer, thy *sins be forgiven thee.*' But when the scribes charged Christ with blaspheming because He thus assumed the prerogative of God, did our Lord retract,—did He attempt to correct their mistaken view of His pretensions? Directly the reverse! He proceeded to support His *claims to Divinity* in the *very light* they had considered Him making those claims. 'But that ye may know that the *Son of man* hath power on earth to *forgive sins;* then said He to the sick of the palsy, "Arise, take up thy bed and go to thine own house." '—Here was a miracle wrought, unquestionably, to prove Himself *possessed* of *power* to forgive sins. He therefore was the source of law. He was the party offended. He was God.

May we be permitted now to call your attention to the fact, secondly, That the worship which belongs only to Jehovah is rendered to Christ. It is a fact, of which no reader of the New Testament can remain ignorant, that instances are frequently occurring there, of persons prostrating themselves in worship before Christ. But attempts have been made to show that as in the east prostration before civil rulers was a common practice, so its being paid to Christ can furnish no proof of His Divinity. But nothing can be plainer than that Christ never *received worship* as a civil governor, for He most cautiously avoided giving the least sanction to the idea that he had any *civil pretensions.* Now in the midst of all this care to excite not the least suspicion that He aspired at civil distinction, what inconsistency could be more glaring than habitually to receive worship, like a civil governor? yet where is a hint in all the Divine record of His ever refusing to receive homage, where His worshippers rendered it to Him? The leper came and '*worshipped Him.*' The man cured of blindness said, 'Lord, I believe, and *worshipped Him.*' They came and *worshipped Him*, saying, 'Thou art the Son of God,' Matt. xiv, 33. In none of those instances, or any other, did Christ intimate that worship was inappropriately paid to Him, but taught that all men should '*honor the Son even* as they honor the Father.' But to obviate all *objections* against the worship which our Lord received *being Divine*, we need only to state the fact, that it was rendered to Him after He ascended to heaven. 'He was parted from them, and received up into heaven, and they worshipped Him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy,' Luke xxiv, 51, 52. The worship here mentioned could not have been offered as a token of civil respect, because it was rendered *after* He was *parted from them;* after He was to show Himself in person to them no more on earth. That the HOMAGE of PRAYER is rendered to Christ, as to God, a very few quotations will convince us. 'Lord Jesus,' prayed dying Stephen, 'receive my Spirit.' 'Lord,' said he, 'lay not this sin to their charge.' In the former he acknowledges Christ to be dispenser of the ETERNAL states of men; in the latter he recognizes Him as the *Governor* and *Judge* of men, having power to *remit*, pass by, or visit, their sins. This prayer of Stephen to Christ acknowledges His property in spirits no less than the prayer of Christ

acknowledges His Father's property in spirits—'Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit.'

St. Paul's prayer to be delivered from the thorn in his flesh was evidently addressed to Christ. 'He said unto me, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may rest upon me.' Here strength and power are the same word in the original. He to whom he prayed said, My strength is sufficient for you; but this *strength* or *power* the apostle calls Christ's; therefore it was Christ to whom he prayed. But, leaving unnoticed numerous instances of prayer to Christ, we will only advert to one more expression of it, found in Corinthians: 'Unto the Church of God which is at Corinth, called to be saints, with all that *in every place call upon* the *name* of *Jesus Christ*, our Lord, both theirs and ours.' Here the apostle states that the Church at Corinth, as well as *others* in *every place*, *call on* the *name* of *Christ*. The supreme homage of prayer was therefore rendered to Christ, through all the apostolical Churches.

Supreme ascriptions of *everlasting glory and praise* are perpetually made to Christ by the inspired writers. Among numberless passages adducible to this point, those only that follow shall be selected. 'But grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, to whom be glory both now and for ever,' 2 Peter iii, 18.—'Unto Him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, to *Him* be *glory* and *dominion*, *for ever and ever*.' These ascriptions of eternal glory and everlasting dominion are surely appropriate to none but God, and would involve the grossest idolatry to be rendered to any created being. When the highest *benediction* is craved, Christ is *associated* with the everlasting Father: 'The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.' 'Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ.' These, with little variation, are the forms of benediction habitually adopted by the apostles, in which Christ and the Father are represented as being *equally* the *source* of those highest blessings for which an inspired mind could pray. The Father and the Son must therefore *equally possess* those supreme perfections which alone could originate these blessings.

And indeed there is no fact come down to us from the first ages of Christianity, better authenticated than the fact that Christ was then worshipped by the whole Church. Heathen authorities in support of this fact, might be numerously adduced; but to advert to the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan, where the fact is expressly stated, is sufficient. All the Arians likewise, of the fourth century, who believed Christ superangelic in His nature, with respect to worshipping Him, imitated the general Church. But supreme adoration to Christ is not confined to the Church on earth; it is offered to Him by the *angels* of God, and the *spirits* of the just, in the highest heavens. For He saith, 'Let all the angels of God worship Him.' And in the Revelation the whole unfallen and redeemed universe are heard to make supreme ascriptions to the Lamb: 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, to Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the *Lamb*, for ever and ever,'

Rev. v, 13. Here, in the immediate presence of the Father, at the very foot of His throne, and amid the glories of His person, His adoring host pay no other homage to Him that sitteth on the throne than they render to the LAMB. Now in turning to the Old Testament, we find worship prohibited to any being in any world, excepting Jehovah, under the most dreadful penalty. 'Thou shalt have no other gods before me.' 'Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them,' Exod. xx, 3–5. Christ Himself enforced the same prohibition: 'It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *Him only* shalt thou serve,' Matt. iv, 10. 'He that sacrificeth unto any god, save unto the LORD only, he shall be utterly destroyed,' Exod. xxii, 20. The inspired apostles were Jews, and viewed religious worship as such. Idolatry had not for centuries affected their nation; and, as we have seen, their law was awfully strict in prohibiting any thing like religious worship to all but Jehovah. And they lost no occasion to insist on the great principle of exclusive worship to Him. When Cornelius would worship Peter, he hesitated not a moment to refuse it.—When those of Lystra would pay religious honors to Paul and Barnabas, they instantly forbade it, and shrunk with horror from the very attempt. When St. John (Rev. xix, 10) fell at the feet of a heavenly inhabitant, the angel interdicted even an outward act of religious homage, and insisted on the great *rule* and *maxim*, 'Worship God.' But with the fulminations of that law in their ears, which forbade worship to any in the whole universe but to God alone, the apostles *adored* Christ; in that world where no note of the eternal song is raised but to Jehovah, all the angelic and redeemed hosts adore the Messiah, with that dreadful interdict dropping from His lips, 'Him only shalt thou serve.' Christ received the highest worship from His adoring disciples; the Church therefore on earth, while under the full blaze of inspiration, and the angels in heaven before the eternal Majesty, must have been the grossest idolaters, or Jesus Christ is the supreme God. He Himself could never have taught that 'all men should honor Him as they honor the Father,' unless He and the Father are one Being.

The next evidences of our Savior's Divinity to which we shall refer, will be adduced to support the fact,

Thirdly, That the titles which can only belong to Jehovah are appropriated to Christ.

God says, 'I am Jehovah: that is my name, and my glory I will not give to another.' 'I am Jehovah: and there is none else, there is no God beside me.' Thou whose name alone is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth.* Here the great God appropriates this name to Himself, to the exclusion of all other beings in the universe. Though in a few instances this name is found connected with persons and places, yet it is not descriptive of those persons or places, but merely of the events connected with them; which events are intended to mark the interposition of God. It is one thing for a name to be so given as to *describe* the *Divine interposition* in a place, or in behalf of a person; and it is another very different thing to make it *descrip-*

* Where the word in the original Hebrew is *Jehovah*, our translators have usually written it LORD, in capitals, to distinguish it from another word in that language which is also rendered Lord, but is frequently applied to creatures; it will be perceived that we use the word Jehovah as they have sometimes, and should have always left it.

tive of the *person* bearing the name. Now in this *latter sense* the name Jehovah is found applied to no created being. If then it is so applied to Christ by Divine authority, He must be *uncreated*—must be God. That it is so applied to Him, but few quotations are needful to show. St. Matthew quotes and applies to Christ the third verse of the 40th of Isaiah, 'For this is He that was spoken of by the Prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight,' Matt. iii, 3. The other evangelist makes the same application to this prophecy, representing John as the herald of *Jesus*, *whom* the prophet called *Jehovah*. Indeed nothing can be plainer than that He whom the prophet calls Jehovah, is that *Jesus* whom the evangelist calls the *Lord*. Jesus is therefore Jehovah. There is no doubt but the title Lord is often used in the New Testament in a subordinate sense; but whenever the writers of this Testament apply it to Him whom the Old Testament calls Jehovah, they can but use it in that *high sense* in which it would be blasphemy to apply it to any but to the Creator. In this sense it is most unquestionably used in the passage before us. Also in Luke, 'And many of the children of Israel shall He turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before Him in the spirit and power of Elias,' Luke i, 15–17. HIM, beyond all question, refers to the Lord their God. Christ therefore, before whom John shall go, is He whom the prophet calls *Jehovah*, their God. St. Paul makes a similar application of this ineffable name to Christ, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved,' Rom. x, 13. There is a quotation from Joel, where the prophet says, 'Whosoever shall call on the name of Jehovah shall be delivered,' Joel ii, 32. As St. Peter applies this prophecy to our Savior, the 'Lord' mentioned by the apostle must be Christ, whom the prophet therefore calls Jehovah. Now should we show that God claims the name Jehovah, so as to *deny it to all other beings*, having shown that it is Divinely applied to Christ, we shall thereby prove that Christ is the *Supreme God*. 'And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the name of God Almighty; but by my name Jehovah was I not known to them,' Exod. vi, 3.—'That men may know that thou, whose name ALONE is Jehovah, art the most high over all the earth,' Psa. lxxxiii, 18. Here the name Jehovah is denied to all other beings, and declared to belong to God ALONE. Having then shown that inspiration applies it to Christ, He, most certainly, must be the supreme God.

It is certain that in the New Testament the term *God* is never applied to any man: yet, in its highest sense, it is applied to Christ.—'And they shall call His name *Immanuel;* which, being interpreted, is *God with us*,' Matt. i, 23. 'And the Word was God,' John i, 1; God in the highest possible sense, because without the Word was not any thing created that was made. The *Word* was therefore *God*, the *Creator*. 'In His Son, Jesus Christ. This is the *true God*, and eternal life,' 1 John v, 20. 'In Him dwelleth all the *fulness* of the Godhead,' Col. ii, 9. 'Who is over all, *God* blessed for ever,' Rom. ix, 5. For 'He thought it not robbery to be *equal* with God,' Phil. ii, 6. When the Jews charged Him with making 'Himself equal with God,' He therefore intended they should so understand His claim. This list of quotations might be vastly lengthened; but these are suffi-

cient, as they almost all associate the term God, as applied to our 'Savior, with other titles and circumstances which demonstrate most fully that the term was used by the inspired penman in its *highest sense* of *true* and *proper Deity* when they applied it to Christ.' In these and similar passages the term is associated with *Jehovah;* with acts of *creative energy;* with *supreme dominion;* with *eternal life*, and with terms that distinguish His human nature from His Divine nature; such as that selected from the epistle to the Romans, 'Of whom concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, *God blessed for ever.*'

How could the New Testament writers use terms better adapted than these, to mislead the minds of men, and plunge all following generations in the deepest idolatry, if they did not intend to teach the supreme Godhead of Christ? Let us add to these evidences,

Fourthly, The arguments which prove that the attributes by which the great Creator is known, are ascribed to and claimed by Christ.

All that is known to us of God, as to His *essence*, is, that He is a Spirit. But of His attributes He has spoken to us more largely.—Beside His moral attributes, which to a limited extent are communicable, He possesses what are called *natural perfections;* the high and awful attributes, *omnipotence*, *omniscience*, *omnipresence*, *eternity*, and all others without which these could not invest Him: these, from their very nature, must for ever be incommunicable. Therefore, if all these, or any one of them, be Divinely ascribed to Christ, He is thereby proved to be the *only God* of which creation or Revelation speaks. For nothing can be more indubitable than that no one infinite attribute can *exist alone:* if it could, there might be as many infinite beings as there are infinite attributes. But as one infinite attribute necessarily supposes *a capacity for all others*, it is absurd to suppose there can be more than one being possessing such capacity. For to suppose more than one is to make all others merely a *mental repetition* of that one.

If, therefore, the Scriptures ascribe *one infinite attribute* to Christ, they thereby make Him the supreme God.

But it will appear in the sequel that *all the attributes* by which Jehovah has made Himself known, invest Jesus Christ.

ETERNITY is ascribed to Him: 'Unto us a child is born; His name shall be called the mighty God, the everlasting Father,' Isa. ix, 6.—That Christ is the subject of this description, admits of no question; not that He is the *everlasting Father* in his relation to the other persons in the Trinity, but only in relation to all else that exists; as all else is the *offspring* of His power.

To settle the question for ever, whether *eternity belongs to Christ*, nothing more can be needful than to find it claimed by Him *in the same language* in which Jehovah claims it. Now *this very thing is done* in these scriptures: 'I am the first, and the last, and beside me there is no God. Before me was there no God formed, neither shall there be after me,' Isa. xlv, 6, and xlviii, 10. 'I,' says Christ, 'am the *first* and *last;* I am He that liveth and was dead; *Alpha* and *Omega*, the *beginning* and the *end*, the *first* and the *last*,' Rev. i, 17. Concerning Christ it is said, 'Thou Bethlehem, Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall He come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, *from everlasting*,' Micah v, 2. Of Jehovah it is said,

'From everlasting to everlasting thou art God,' Psa. xc, 2. The self-existence and eternity of Jehovah are revealed in this peculiar language, 'I am that I am,' Exod. iii, 14. Evidently with an eye on this expression our Lord declared, 'Before Abraham was, I AM,' John viii, 58. Thus grasping the past and the future, Christ, like the infinite Jehovah, *pervades all duration.* Now, what could be more misleading to men, and more blasphemous in Christ, than so repeatedly to claim eternity, in the very expressions almighty God had done, were *He* not the *eternal One?* for certain it is that if any eternal being is revealed to us in these oracles, Christ is that *unbeginning existence.*

Now, the impossibility of *communicating* this attribute to any being who has not *always* possessed it, will appear from this single reflection, it makes Him *begin to be, who never began to be;* that is, it assigns existence to Him before He possessed it. For, if He can *now* be eternal who was not *always so*, He must have existed when He did not exist, which is impossible; if then, that which had a beginning cannot become that which had *no beginning*, the Scriptural ascription of eternity to Christ proves Him to be the uncreated God.

OMNIPRESENCE likewise invests Him. This ubiquity, or power of extending Himself over the whole universe, belongs to God *alone*, yet it enrobes our great Redeemer. 'No man,' says Christ, 'hath ascended up to heaven but He that came down from heaven, even the Son of man, which is in heaven,' John iii, 13. 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,' Matt. xviii, 20. 'Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world,' Matt. xxviii, 20. In the first of these passages Christ declares Himself to be in that heaven from which, by becoming incarnate, He represents Himself as having come down; and there, too, *at the same time while He was on earth*, in the midst of His disciples. In the next text He promises to be present, *over the whole globe*, wherever two or three are met together in His name. There may be created spirits that can dart with lightning speed from place to place, and so in a brief period visit, successively, all worshipping assemblies on the footstool; but this would not fulfil the promise we are considering: '*There am I*,' not *have been*, and *shall be*, which are the utmost within the power of every created being. In our third quotation He engages the apostles His attendance on them *all* at *all times:* 'alway to the end of the world.' This would be impossible to any creature in the universe; any but God must leave one to go to another; must be absent from all others when present with one. He that can be with *twelve apostles* at *the same time*, while whole continents separate them, can be at the same time with *all other beings.*

Now this all-pervading power is, by St. Paul, expressly attributed to Christ: 'by Him do all things consist.' As no being can act where it is not, and as Christ upholds all things, He must be present with all things. As He is the great conservator of all things, He can be absent from none. But if Christ is present with every being, if He fills heaven, and earth, and the whole universe, He must be wherever the Father is; He and the Father must therefore be the Supreme Being.

OMNISCIENCE also belongs to Christ: though it is impossible for us to determine to what extent the knowledge of the highest created intelligence reaches, we certainly know that it can never *extend* to *all things.*

For Jehovah claims the prerogative of knowing all things, to the exclusion of all other beings.

The two kinds of knowledge which consists in searching the hearts of men, and knowing all the secrets of futurity, are peculiar to Jehovah, but *both these kinds* of knowledge belong to Christ. They are claimed by Him in the New Testament, in the *same language* they are claimed by Jehovah in the Old Testament. By the knowledge of futurity, the true God distinguishes Himself from all creatures. 'I am God, and there is none like me; declaring the end from the beginning, and from ancient times the things that are not yet done,' Isa. xlvi, 9–10. But this knowledge of futurity belongs also to Christ. 'Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that believed not, and who should betray Him,' John vi, 64. Though prophets and apostles have often, by express revelation, obtained a knowledge of particular events in futurity, no one ever pretended to have this knowledge from his *own power*. The moment the spirit of vision was withdrawn from the prophet, the future was a blank, dark as a starless midnight: not so with Christ, for when it is said, 'Jesus knew their thoughts,' it is added, that He PERCEIVED IN HIS SPIRIT that they so reasoned; not by *a* spirit that was given to Him for a particular purpose, as to the prophets, but by *His own spirit*; by an original faculty, which, as we have seen, belongs only to God.

Like God, Christ also searches the heart. 'I the Lord search the heart, and try the reins, saith Jehovah,' Jer. xvii, 10. 'And all the Churches shall know that *I am He* that searcheth the reins and the heart,' responds Jesus Christ. 'Thou, even thou, only knowest the hearts of all the children of men,' 1 Kings viii, 39. 'But Jesus did not commit Himself unto them, because He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for He *knew what was in man*.'—Here again Christ claims this heart-searching prerogative in 'the full style and majesty of the *Jehovah of the Old Testament*.' As then Christ expressly claims that from which God excludes all creatures, Christ cannot be a creature, but must be God Himself. To these attributes which belong to Christ, OMNIPOTENCE should also be added; as no being can possess a degree of power beyond its capacity, it is impossible that almighty power should be DELEGATED to any being in the universe. To Him who alone possesses it, there was none to give it; and He can impart it to none, unless He first bestow an infinite capacity; and to do that would be creating one equal to Himself, which is impossible. Therefore to communicate omnipotent power is not the prerogative of God Himself. If, then, Christ possess this, He must *always* have possessed it: He must be God.

That He did possess it, is evident from His own Godlike claims. 'Whatsoever things,' says He, 'the Father doeth, these also doeth the Son likewise,' for 'all things the Father hath, are mine,' John xvi, 15. But if this be so, that Christ does whatsoever things God the Father does, and if He is the *proprietor* of all that belongs to the Father, then most certainly omnipotent power invests Him. And this is that which is most expressly ascribed to Him, where it is affirmed, 'HE IS THE ALMIGHTY,' Rev. i, 8.

Now if our great Redeemer swayed a control over all nature, if He could still the winds and the waves—cure the most inveterate dis-

eases—reject infernal spirits—pardon the sins of the guilty—summon the dead from a state of putrefaction—scrutinize the hearts of all the living—and like the God of the prophets, throw open the secrets of futurity—and all this in His own name, and by His own power—if He could be with His ministers through all the coming ages of time—be present with His worshippers wherever two or three are met in His name, over the whole globe—be exalted to absolute dominion over all beings, in earth and heaven—be the object of supreme adoration from men and angels—be associated with the Father in the highest ascriptions made to the Godhead—bear the awful names appropriated to the great Jehovah: and if He did possess those terribly sublime attributes without which there could be no God—the attributes omnipotence, omniscience, and eternity—if men and angels, earth and heaven, all things visible and invisible, owe their existence to His *fiat*, and their continuance to the word of His power—if He is to fold up creation like a garment, and remove its mighty mass when He has done with it—if He is to quicken all the dead at the resurrection morn—become the universal Judge of the accountable universe, and pronounce the unchangeable destinies of all concerned in the final judgment—if all this be so, who will deny supreme Divinity to the Savior of the world?

Finally, we were to show in the last place, That the Gospel proceeds on the supposition that Christ possesses supreme Divinity.

1. It does this first, by supposing that an *atonement for sin* has been made. That the Gospel, as a *saving system*, rests on the doctrine of atonement, is so evident to a reader of the New Testament, that the great evidences of it furnished by that volume scarcely need be thrown together. The few following scriptures, therefore, are all that shall be adduced for its support: 'He hath made Him to be sin (a sin offering) for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him.' 'Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.' 'And He is the propitiation for our sins.' 'Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in His blood.' 'I lay down my life for the sheep.' 'He gave Himself for us—the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God.' 'Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.'

By these citations, and many more similar ones that might be made, the fact of the atonement is most fully sustained. For here Christ is said to take the sinner's place, and for the express purpose that the sinner might be made righteous through this *substitution*. And, by that strong expression of the *punitive* nature of His sufferings, He is said to be a 'curse for us,' for the sole object of redeeming us from the curse of the law; that when He died for the unjust, it was that *as such* He might bring them to God. And that His death propitiated the wrath of offended Majesty is here made unquestionable by the repeated assertion that He was 'set forth to be *a propitiation* for our sins.'

But if Christ be not God, He has made *no atonement* by *His death*: for how could a creature supply the delinquency of other creatures? If the sufferer be a mere *creature*, his powers to suffer were *received from the Creator*. How then could he take his Maker's property, and merit something by it from his Maker? But if the sufferer could do

something in behalf of others above what is required of him, on his own account, just so far his services might have been dispensed with,—just so far his services are dispensed with; for justice can never REQUIRE one to merit for another. But if any part of his services can be *dispensed with*, for the same reason *all his services* may be; and then, as his Maker has *no claim* on his services, He cannot justly punish him for devoting them to another. And if this is true concerning one created intelligence, it certainly may be true of all created intelligences; and then the whole government of God is eternally at an end. It is therefore impossible for any created being to merit any thing from his Creator in behalf of another; consequently Christ is either God, or there can be no *merits in His death.* This conclusion has been so powerfully felt by the rejecters of our Lord's Divinity, that now all the intelligent among them openly discard the atonement. Indeed, so clear and forcible are the reasons that conduce to *this conclusion*, that no man of letters would hazard his reputation for intelligence by embracing these premises and rejecting the conclusion.

By those less accustomed to push out principles to legitimate consequences, it has been asked, whether God could not accept *any sacrifice for sin*, which Himself might appoint, whether it were the blood of an *animal*, or of a *man*, or of *any other being?* God can undoubtedly. But God cannot consistently appoint any sacrifice to take away sin, unless it consist of more than a mere creature. For an *arbitrary* appointment to execute a particular purpose, can add no new excellency to the *nature* of him so appointed. And it is the *excellency* of the thing sacrificed, in which alone the *merits* of *the sacrifice* are found. Hence the Scriptures constantly connect with the merits of the cross the very *Divinity* of the sufferer. It was Jehovah who was pierced, Zech. xii, 10. It was God that purchased the Church with His own blood, Acts xx, 28. It was the Lord that bought us, 2 Peter ii, 1. It was the Lord of glory that was sacrificed, 1 Cor. ii, 8. Indeed, if a mere *creature sacrifice* could take away sin, as some of the rejecters of our Savior's Godhead maintain, how egregiously did St. Paul blunder in asserting that it was 'not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sin!'

You will readily perceive that these arguments, like nearly all we have employed in this discourse, overturn the *Arian* no less than the *Socinian* system. For the distance must ever be the same between the Creator and the *highest* created intelligence in the universe, that it is between the Creator and a mere man; as all beings *alike* can bear no comparison to the infinite One.

I care not then how high you place Christ above the brightest cherub that burns in Jehovah's presence; only deny Him *supreme Divinity*, and you make Him no less a dependent being than the infant that sleeps in your arms. For what can be more chimerical than to imagine a being between the creature and the Creator, one that was neither made nor existed of himself? What can be more absurd than to suppose such a being to exist; a being that neither had beginning, or was without beginning—one that is dependent on another, and yet dependent on no one. All these *contradictions*, and many more, are involved in that *strange* system which denies that Christ is a mere created, dependent creature, and yet maintains that He is not the *supreme God.*

2. The Gospel, as a system, can have no existence when the doctrine of *pardon* is rejected. For it declares that 'all have sinned;' that 'we are children of wrath, even as others;' that 'there is none that doeth good,' and that 'judgment has come upon all men, to condemnation.' Now unless this system *provides for pardon*, it necessarily leaves man interminably in this state of guilt, wrath, and condemnation.

As a saving system, therefore, the Gospel can exist no longer than it involves the doctrine of pardon. But this doctrine involves the proper Godhead of Jesus Christ; for we have just shown that there can be no atonement unless he that makes it be supreme; and if we now prove there can be *no forgiveness without an atonement*, we shall have thereby demonstrated that the atoning Messiah is God.

If then sin could be pardoned without *satisfaction* by *atonement*, it must either be done *according* to the law it has violated, or *in opposition* to that law. If *according to the law*, then the law makes *provision* for its own violation. But this is impossible; for were it so, the law would threaten the offender with death, and at the same time counteract its own operations, by *providing for the offender's escape*. The penalty of violating it would be the blessing of pardon, and not the curse it had threatened: that is, the provision it makes would destroy the *threat* which it utters, and the penalty which it threatens, would annihilate the remedy it proposes. *So this marvellous law would* DEVOUR ITSELF. But if these absurdities are too glaring to allow us to push the principle any farther, let us next inquire whether sin can be pardoned in *opposition* to *the law* it has broken. If it can, then in pardoning it God must act against His own law. But if He can act against *one* of His laws, He can, for the same reason, act against *all* His laws; and then, by this single conclusion, all the moral perfections of His nature are blotted out for ever.

It must then be impossible to pardon sin, without *satisfaction by atonement*. The doctrine, therefore, of pardon necessarily involves that of our Redeemer's Godhead.

3. The Gospel attributes to Christ *two natures*, one of which is perfectly human, and the other which is supremely Divine.* References

* This doctrine has been rejected because of its *mysteriousness*. That it involves *mystery*, there can be no doubt; otherwise, it would be unlike any other subject to which created minds extend. What is there in the animal, vegetable, or mineral kingdom, which in the *manner* of its being, is not *impenetrably mysterious*? Where has there been a mind so highly gifted, as to *perceive* how gravity ACTS? how motion is *communicated*? how a vegetable *grows*, or *how* his own blood circulates? Though these are objects of his own senses, he can no more perceive HOW they are, than he can perceive *how three* persons are one Jehovah. Only confound the MANNER HOW a thing is so, with the FACT that it is so, and there is no one truth in nature, or revelation, but will be wanting evidence to command rational belief. Now it is by *confounding* these two *distinct* things, that this objection against the Godhead of Christ has all its force. A *fact* may be revealed, clear as vision, and yet everlasting ages may not *unfold* the *reasons* of it. The eternity of Jehovah is an unquestionable fact, but where is there a created mind that can comprehend HOW He is unbeginning? By close attention it will appear that the *mystery* of our Savior's Divinity originates in the same cause in which every other *mystery* does, viz. the want of capacity in finite minds to grasp the whole. As then our faith has *nothing* to do with the *mystery*, but merely with the *fact* that involves the mystery, the *mysteriousness* of a well authenticated fact should never unsettle our faith in the truth of it.

are so numerously made in the New Testament record to natures so *dissimilar* in our Lord's person, that the rejecters of His Divinity have never been able to reconcile them to their system. These scriptures may be ranked in three classes: the first are expressive merely of His *humanity*. 'He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief;' 'He was an hungered, thirsty, weary;' of the last judgment no man knoweth the time, 'neither the Son, but the Father;' 'Then shall the Son also, Himself, be subject to Him that put all things under Him.' Such passages are as clearly *referable to humanity*, as those in the second class are to *Divinity*. 'Adorn the doctrine of God our Savior;' 'My Lord and my God;' 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever;' 'And the Word was God.' These, and the like scriptures, can no more be restricted to the limited import of the former class, than Jehovah can be equalled by a creature. There is a third class of passages, by which is brought to view the *twofold nature* of our Lord. Among these are, 'The Word was made flesh;' 'Of whom, concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever.'

Now if our Lord possessed two natures, it would indeed have been surprising, if *each one* respectively had never been referred to. Had He been merely man, no matter how replete with communicated grace, He could never, without blasphemy, be entitled God. Had He not been man—had His Divinity *absorbed* His manhood, He could not, in truth, be represented as in the first class of quotations. But if these *two natures* remain in Him *unseparated* and yet *distinct*, then these texts, otherwise irreconcilable, most fitly express the two natures of His person.

Some things are certainly true of the human soul, that are not true of the body. We attribute sometimes to the one what we deny to the other; though we usually speak of them together, as they form but one person. In like manner some things are true of the *manhood* of Christ, which cannot be offered of His *Godhead*. Thus, when our Lord speaks of the poor, He says, 'Me ye have not always with you.' Yet on another occasion He assures His apostles that He would be 'with them *always*:' and when praying in the audience of His disciples He says, 'Now I am no more in the world;' and again, 'The Son of man which is in heaven.'

Now all these propositions cannot be true of either His human or Divine nature; but they are most exactly *true* of His *two natures* respectively. Though He was not *always* here with respect to His human nature, He is always present with His ministers, as to His Godhead. He was not in heaven as to His manhood, but He was there as to His Divine nature. And indeed it would be an easy task to collect a score of texts directly contradictory, were they all applied to *one nature* in Christ. The propositions that He was made lower than the angels, and yet that He was so vastly above them that they were commanded to adore Him; that He was the son of David, and yet that He was David's Lord; that He was before Abraham, and yet was not born until the days of Augustus Cesar; that the earth and the heavens were the work of His hands, and yet these had stood four thousand years before the angel shouted His birth; that He had glory with the Father before the world was, and yet forty centuries had been

measured out to the world before He was born in Bethlehem. Now such propositions, which might be multiplied indefinitely, can never be made to coincide, if Christ have not *the two natures* Trinitarians ascribe to Him.

So far are these scriptures, then, that make Christ *inferior to the Father*, from opposing His supreme Divinity, that they most exactly fall in *with our views* of the dignity of His person, and can be reconciled with those passages that make Him supreme, on no other ground. The Gospel system insists on these two distinct natures in the great Messiah, to make His death availing. For, while on one hand it denies that the *Divinity* of Christ *suffered*, on the other it imputes all the merits of His *human sufferings* to His *supporting* Divinity. It maintains that the human nature became capable of a degree of suffering, *by its connection* with the unsuffering Divinity, of which no other being in the universe was capable ; that by virtue of this connection a value was *communicated* to the sufferings of the humanity, of which God alone can adequately conceive. It is then on the merits of Him who possessed two natures, one in which to suffer, and the other by which to stamp untold worth on the sufferings ; it is on the merits of such a sufferer alone, on which the Gospel bases all human hope.

4. The Christian system proposes the *love* and *humility* of Christ, as the great inspiring example for the whole Church, in all ages. The evidence of this proposition stands out on the New Testament record in so bold relief, that formally to prove it would be to insult your understanding. But if Christ be not God, but a mere creature, why are His love and humility so highly *eulogized* in the New Testament. If He be God, the reason is obvious ; for then His condescension was astonishing, as His felicity was *full ;* by no enterprise in which He could engage, could it be *increased :* therefore, both when He originated and executed the plan of redeeming us, He knew He could gain by this arduous work no *accession* to His happiness. He knew that it had always been infinite, and therefore incapable of increase, and that leaving us unredeemed could, for the same reason, result in no *diminution* of His happiness. The redeeming work must then have been the fruit of the most *amazing love*, on the supposition that the Redeemer was God.

But if He be not God, if He be a *super-angelic Being*, as the Arians believe, or a *mere man*, as Socinians maintain, *self love alone* might have induced Him to undertake what He did for us. For if He were a mere creature, what was His *humility*, or what were His *sufferings* more than those of *many others*, who never received a thousandth part of the reward bestowed on Christ for His sufferings ? Did He continue His ministry through three or four years, in the midst of some persecution? So did St. Paul, through nearly *ten times* that period, and perhaps with *ten times* the persecution. Did Christ endure a trial before an unjust judge, with buffetings and scourgings ? So did the apostles in *numerous instances.* Did He finally die, after a few hours' agony on the cross ? So have the martyrs, after enduring the most studied cruelties through successive days. And why do the inspired writers dwell on the sufferings of Christ, in strains so lofty, if the pangs that have extorted the groans of a *whole creation* deserved not the *name* of sufferings ? But what *proportion* do the sufferings of

Christ, as a mere creature, bear to the *reward* which He received for them? As a consequence of His sufferings, He was raised to the place of a *mediator* between Jehovah and the whole race of man—was elevated above all the angels of God, and seated on 'the right hand of the Majesty on high,' and acquired the title of Lord, ascribed to Him by every creature in the universe on its bended knees.

Now what are a *few hours'* suffering, compared to all this peerless glory, to which no *created being* can ever attain? Indeed, instead of becoming *poor* for our sakes, as the apostle urges, He became immensely *rich*, by His undertaking for us. Instead of God's so loving *the world* as to give His Son for it, it would be more appropriate to say that He so loved *His Son* as to honor Him with an appointment to that great enterprise.

For if He be a mere creature, there is no one for whom He died, that reaps a millionth part of the benefit from His death that He does Himself. Can His death, then, be an expression of so much love *to others*, when in it He could but have an eye on ten thousand times more benefit *to Himself?*

If Christ be but a creature, then never let us hear again of His *humbling* Himself in becoming obedient to death; but rather of His exalting Himself by it above any being God had created. If He be not God, let us hear no more of His sufferings for the Church being superlative; for many of His disciples have endured much more for the benefit of religion. If Christ be not God, let us hear no more of His death being an expression of *generous love* to the world, when it procured more for Himself than for the whole universe beside.

Indeed, if Jesus be a mere creature, why is our salvation ascribed to *Him*, rather than to *Paul*, who suffered, and labored vastly more than Christ to procure it? Why is not the love of Paul, rather than the love of Jesus, a theme of boundless praise through earth and heaven? But to conclude. By a retrospective glance at the evidences we have now collected for the support of this truth, we find every thing belonging to Christ, which the Scriptures make peculiar to the self-existent God. Like God He made the worlds, claims them for His own, and will remove them at His pleasure. Like God He pardoned the sins of the guilty, sent forth the eternal Spirit, and wrought in His own name the most stupendous miracles. Like the Supreme Being, He is approached in prayer by the universal Church on earth; He is the object of praise from the redeemed spirits in heaven, and receives unceasing homage from all the angels of God. In His name no less than in that of the Father, the inspired benediction is pronounced, the most sacred oaths are uttered, and the ordinance of baptism is administered. To Christ, as to Jehovah, belong those titles by which alone the ineffable One has made Himself known; titles that He has expressly denied to every other being in the universe; titles for the assumption of which, if He were not God, it was the duty of the Jews to stone Him. Like the infinite God, He claimed the perfections of an eternal nature, so that it could not be robbery to reckon Himself equal with God. The awfully sublime attributes of Almighty power, boundless knowledge, every where pervading presence, and unbeginning existence, belonged to Him. Like God He undertook to dispose of the *claims* of eternal government by atonement, and to open

the way for pardon to a whole world exposed to the unanswered claims of law.

Most certainly, then, the Bible either reveals nothing that God *has done*, or Christ is God. It either informs us of no *name* belonging to Jehovah, or Christ is that Jehovah to whom it belongs. It either speaks of no *attributes* that invest the eternal One, or Christ is He whom they enrobe. It either reveals no *object* of *worship* in the universe, or Christ is that object; and indeed the Bible either speaks of no God *in being*, or Christ is that INFINITE ONE.

Let it also be remembered by those who reject the Redeemer's Divinity, that they thereby reject *the atonement* imputed to Him; all pardon of sin through the atonement, and all regenerating operations of the Divine Spirit on the heart. And then the Gospel is a dead letter, and the ministers of it uncommissioned wanderers.

As then, my brethren, the Divinity of Christ is the key-stone of the Christian system, let us cleave to the doctrine as to the only hope of our lapsed nature, and prepare to join with 'every creature in heaven and on earth,' in supreme ascriptions 'to Him that sitteth on the throne, and to the LAMB for ever and ever.' Amen.

AN ESSAY ON CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.

BY B. F. SHEPARD,
Of the Protestant Episcopal Seminary.

IF every religious opinion which engages the attention of man was judged by its practical importance, how many of those which are the subject of frequent and almost interminable disputes, would sink into forgetfulness. Many of the points which occupied the field of controversy in the middle ages, and to the examination of which were brought profound learning and the acutest logic, are now regarded as not worth contending for, or as too plain to be disputed. Polemics have generally shown themselves most fond of those subjects on which it is impossible to arrive at any satisfactory conclusion—subjects too subtle and abstruse to admit of clear investigation, or conclusive argument. Here argument may be met by argument, and sophistry by sophistry, equally plausible and equally obscure. If they cannot gain a victory, they can at least avoid the appearance of a defeat—if they cannot convince or persuade, they can talk profoundly, (or what often passes for the same thing, unintelligibly,) and wrap themselves up in a mist of scholastic jargon and incomprehensible speculations, which the human mind is prone to admire and applaud. Such were the disputes between the nominalists and realists—that about the perpetual virginity of the blessed virgin—the eternal generation of Christ—the origin of evil, and the consistency of the Divine sovereignty and human free agency. But I need not refer to examples; for they will readily suggest themselves to every one at all acquainted with the course of metaphysical or theological controversy. Had all the labor, learning, and talent, which have been spent upon such points, been employed in efforts to make men wiser and better, the state of the world would have been vastly different from what we now see it.

There are few opinions of more practical importance than that which we have placed at the head of this article; and yet there are few which are less regarded or more extensively disbelieved. Many of our most numerous and excellent denominations of Christians regard it as dangerous and impious. They do not hesitate to say that it proceeds from pride of superior light and other corrupt passions of the heart, and that those who profess it are on the very brink of ruin. We regret exceedingly that a doctrine which we regard as so precious, should be thus viewed by any portion of our fellow Christians. But we have too deep a respect for their Christian spirit—for their evangelical and deep-toned piety, and their love for truth, to suspect that they are influenced by any other feelings than love for their Savior and a watchful solicitude for the salvation of souls. It is with the utmost diffidence that we venture to advocate a doctrine which has been rejected by so large a portion of the holiest men that ever lived, and which is now opposed by many whom we highly esteem and love. Even the Church to which we belong, and in whose communion we hope to spend our days laboring for the cause of the Redeemer, almost universally rejects it. But it appears to us of the most consoling character, and of the highest importance to the welfare of Zion.

This doctrine, like many others, has been exposed to much prejudice on account of the errors with which it has frequently been connected. When the doctrine of perfection is mentioned, we are often referred to the brothers and sisters of the Free Spirit in Germany, in the fourteenth century, who, under the guise of holiness or a union with God, threw aside all law, all ordinances, and all restraint, and advocated doctrines and practices as abhorrent to religion as they were to decency and common sense. Antinomianism has sometimes been its attendant, and hence it is inferred that a rejection of the law is a necessary appendage to the doctrine of Christian perfection. And the views that are entertained in this country by those termed Perfectionists, are calculated to foster this prejudice against the doctrine even in its pure and Scriptural form. We hold many of the opinions of this last-named sect in as much abhorrence as any of our brethren. We believe that in some important particulars they are striking at the foundation of the Gospel itself, and that the propagation of their opinions will be followed by most disastrous results. That all Christians are perfect, and that the law is not binding on them, are opinions which those who hold the Scriptural doctrine of perfection will be the first to condemn. If we can only succeed in freeing the doctrine from these objectionable features, and in doing away the prejudices that have consequently arisen, our labor will not be in vain.

Our object now is to consider briefly the nature and proof of the doctrine of Christian perfection. What then are we to understand by this doctrine?

We will first answer it negatively. It is not perfection in knowledge. This would be omniscience. Knowledge of spiritual things, indeed, will be greatly increased in the perfect Christian; in the same manner as it is constantly increasing in every Christian as he grows in grace. Just so far as a preparation of heart, and a conformity to the image of God, are requisite to a full comprehension of Divine truth, so far will his knowledge be increased. But the nature of God, and his own soul,

and the works of creation, will still present innumerable difficulties.—On these subjects, and in all departments of human knowledge, he, like every other man, will know only in part. It is a moral, not an intellectual perfection.

Nor will he be exempt from mistakes. Christian perfection does not confer infallibility. Errors of judgment or of ignorance may still occur; but when they are seen, they will immediately be corrected. His *end* will always be good, his *motives* good, and the means by which he pursues his end such as appear to him most wise and just. The Spirit will guide him into all essential truth, and under the influence of that truth he will act. On unimportant points he may commit errors or mistakes; but they will be the result of human weakness and infirmity, and not sin. Infirmities will exist till death is swallowed up in glory. But infirmities are not sins. We cannot here forbear noticing what seems to us a common mistake, and which it is of essential importance to correct. It is the disposition to regard all *errors* as *sins*. In many cases this is virtually taken for granted, when it is professedly denied; and when a Christian is seen falling into imprudences, or erring ever so innocently, it is thought preposterous to suppose that such a one is or can be perfect. Now it should be remembered that nothing is sin, unless it proceed from a bad motive. The motive alone is regarded by God, and whosoever is actuated by pure love to Him will be approved, although a mistaken judgment or incorrect views may lead him into some error in practice. Let it not be thought that I am setting aside conduct as a test of character. I have before said that the perfect Christian will be led by the Spirit into all essential truth. Essential truth operating upon a Christian heart will prevent all essential errors in practice. Whenever these do occur, whatever professions are made, it may be set down as certain that they do not proceed from truth and the Spirit of God. The sincere inquirer after truth and duty, whose heart is filled with love to God, will find the Bible a sufficient guide to preserve him from all sin and from serious mistakes. There is no surer proof of the folly and impiety of the pretensions made by some among us to superior holiness and light, than the very conduct which they claim to be the result of these, but which is utterly at variance with the Spirit and principles of the word of God. To this every pretension, principle, and practice must be brought. Whatever is at variance with it must be wrong. No impulses, no inward light or pretended visions, can alter one of its doctrines or supersede one of its claims. If the doctrine of Christian perfection is not found here, it must at once be rejected. Against this, the experience and feelings of millions should have no weight. Human opinions and feelings are fallible, but the word of God standeth sure. We are more explicit on this point, because those who hold the doctrine of perfection have been accused of undervaluing the Bible.—Some, we admit, have elevated their own feelings above the oracles of God, and have made pretensions to light and purity, just in proportion as they have sunk into the clutches of Satan. Such may have gone out from us, but they are not of us. To us the Bible is the only sure guide of faith and practice. It is the only repository of our hopes—the test of our principles, and the guide of our lives.

Again, Christian perfection does not give exemption from tempta-

tion. Our Savior Himself was tempted, and it would be strange if all His followers were not. The perfect Christian is still a man, possessing the faculties and subject to the feelings of a man. But temptations are not sins; and every temptation will be resisted as successfully and as sinlessly as those of our Savior.

Nor does Christian perfection imply the highest possible degree of holiness. In this sense the angels in heaven are not perfect, for they are destined to go on increasing in holiness for ever. No being but God is *infinitely* holy. Every being that is not infinitely holy may increase in holiness to all eternity.

What then is Christian perfection? We answer, It is entire freedom from sin, and supreme love to God. The old man with his affections and lusts has been put off. The carnal mind—the corrupt passions—the hatred to God, have been entirely subdued, and he that was before supremely selfish, sold under sin, now loves God with all his heart, mind, and strength, and his neighbor as himself. No other object is allowed to share his affections with God. His *whole* heart is His. He loves friends and the brethren; but his love to them increases instead of diminishing his love to God. In this all his happiness consists, and by this his whole life is directed.

We say that perfection consists in entire freedom from sin and supreme love to God. I do not say that the perfect Christian loves God so much as he is worthy to be loved. He is worthy of infinite love, which no finite being can ever bestow. We are required to love God with all the heart—that is with all *our* heart; not with the heart or powers of an angel. And when we thus love Him, and our neighbor as ourselves, and act under the influence of this love, we fulfil the royal law, and are perfect in the sense in which we understand perfection.—The perfect Christian loves God to the full extent of his powers, and he is not the less perfect from the fact that his powers will expand, and that he will be able to love Him more hereafter. If it were so, glorified spirits and angels in heaven would not be perfect, for they are constantly progressing in holiness and love to God. They all love God to the full extent of their present powers, and in this their perfection consists. And when the Christian loves God with all his powers he will be perfect, however limited those powers may be. And being actuated by supreme love to God, in all his thoughts, words, and deeds, he will be free from all sin. This is Christian perfection; and we believe every Christian may and ought to attain it.

We now proceed to the second part of our subject, namely, the proof that Christian perfection may be attained in this life. This may be drawn from the very nature of sin. What is sin but voluntary disobedience to a known law? The fact that disobedience is voluntary implies that obedience is possible. If the law cannot be obeyed, then it is unjust, and there is no sin in disobeying it; for where there is no ability there is no obligation. We cannot too strongly reprobate the doctrine, that God imposes upon men commands which He gives them no power to obey. Such a supposition makes God a tyrant and the Bible absurd. If it be said that God is ever ready to grant us His Spirit to enable us to do our duty, then the result is just what we are contending for—we have power to obey the commands of God. It matters little, as to the point in hand, whether this power is within us,

or whether it be an external, superadded influence, supplied by the Spirit of God, of which we may always avail ourselves. In either case a command is given us, and the power of obeying it put within our reach. Our guilt consists in neglecting to use this power. If it be said that the sinner's inability to obey the whole law of God is something which he has brought upon himself, and that the Holy Spirit is granted him as an act of mercy to free him from the consequence of his own sin, then I have nothing to object. But if it be asserted that this inability is antecedent to his own agency—something inherent in the nature of the soul, which man did not produce, and cannot even by the aid of God's Spirit destroy, it will lead to the most dangerous consequences. On this principle, a man when he arrives at an age to distinguish between good and evil, finds himself possessed of certain faculties and powers. A law is given him, which in the exercise of these powers it is utterly impossible for him to obey. Damnation is the consequence of disobedience. This inability he did not create and he cannot remove. Whoever is responsible, *he* is not. Now I ask, Can it be just, that that man should be damned? If so, it must be for not performing impossibilities. If *not*, then God is under *obligation* to grant him His Spirit to enable him to obey His commands. This makes the gift of the Spirit an act of *debt* and not of *grace*. And in this case our position still remains good—man will have the power to do his duty and keep the law.*

The distinction will here be made between natural and moral ability, and with reason. This difference, it seems to us, is much greater than is generally supposed; so great indeed that it would be altogether improper to express the two ideas by the same term, did not the want of better language require it. As it is, the expressions moral inability and moral necessity almost always express wrong ideas. A moral inability is in reality no *inability* at all—it is simply *unwillingness*. And when we say a man is morally unable to obey a command of God, we mean simply that he is *unwilling* to obey a command which he has full power to obey. That men are in this sense unable, that is, unwilling to fulfil the requirement of God, we freely admit, and for this reason the Holy Spirit is granted to overcome their unwillingness and constrain them to repent and serve God. This is the view presented throughout the Bible: God gave man a law, and commanded him to obey it. Nothing is said about his ability to comply—it is taken for granted, and every transgression receives its just recompense of reward. Man's only inability then to serve God consists in an unwillingness to do what he knows he can and ought to do. When the sinner is converted this unwillingness is at an end; the corrupt fountain of the heart from which it proceeded, is broken up; self love is subdued and

* We do not exactly agree with our author in the above paragraph. Through the inability brought on us by the original apostacy, we are unable of ourselves to do what God requires, that is, to love God with all the heart:—hence the necessity of conversion. For if we were able to love God in our natural state, the necessity of conversion would be superseded; but our Savior has said, 'Except ye be converted, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Neither can a sinner repent and believe in Jesus Christ, only as he is assisted by the Holy Spirit. But as the Holy Spirit *is* given to all men in the day of their merciful visitation, and every means afforded them for working out their salvation, therefore it is perfectly proper to say to all, Ye have power to do whatever God requires at your hands.—Ed.

the love of God implanted, and becomes henceforth the predominant feeling of the heart. When it becomes supreme and fills the whole soul, then he is a perfect Christian. If the *sinner* can obey the command of God, much more the *Christian*, for he has acquired great moral power by his repentance and conversion. With him the great obstacle has been overcome—the rebellious heart. It is therefore far more probable that the Christian will become perfect, than that the sinner will become a Christian.

But let us proceed to more direct Scriptural proof. Time will by no means allow us to select all the passages that support the doctrine in question. We shall notice only a few of the more obvious.

If a command implies duty, and duty supposes ability, either inherent or conferred, to perform it, then the attainability of perfection may be easily proved from the words of our Savior, Matt. xxii, 37–39, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and thy neighbor as thyself.' Here is a plain command, and full obedience to it constitutes Christian perfection, as we have before shown. The command itself is very clear; there is no obscurity either in the words or the idea. It simply requires that we should love God supremely; that is, to the full extent of our present powers, and our neighbor as ourselves. The only question is, Can these commands be obeyed? Can the *Christian* obey them? for of him alone are we to speak. Can he, in the exercise of all the powers which God has given him, and by the aid of the Holy Spirit, which all who ask will receive, obey these commands, on which hang all the law and the prophets? If he can, then our position is sustained —perfection is attainable. If he cannot, then one of two things will follow; either it is not his duty to obey these first commands of God, or it is his duty to perform impossibilities; for by the supposition obedience to these commands is an impossibility. We leave those who take this ground to settle the controversy between themselves and God.

Again, Matt. v, 48, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' This is a part of our Savior's inimitable sermon on the mount. It seems to be the sum of a variety of instructions, which He had been giving to His disciples. As if wearied with naming particulars, He sums up their whole duty in this, 'Be ye therefore perfect,' &c. What does this injunction mean? Few, I suppose will deny, that it relates to the moral character, not to the intellectual; and therefore cannot mean 'be ye fully instructed in doctrine and duty,' as some have supposed. For to be 'fully instructed in doctrine and duty as God is fully instructed in doctrine and duty,' is nothing less than omniscience. It cannot mean simply 'be ye Christians,' for then every Christian has complied with the full injunction of Christ, however small may be his spiritual attainments. Beside, simply to be Christians, while they are constantly sinning, as many contend that Christians are, is very far from being perfect as God is perfect. On the other hand, no one will pretend that it teaches a perfection of degrees, as it is called, or that it requires men to be holy or perfect in the same degree in which God is perfect, for with finite beings this is impossible. God is infinitely holy. It seems evidently to require unmingled holiness. Be ye holy as God is holy, according to the extent of your powers.

Another passage is found Col. iv, 12, 'Epaphras—saluteth you, always laboring fervently for you in prayers, that ye may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God.' Here is the prayer of a saint, of which the apostle evidently approves. It is of course a reasonable prayer, and one to which he might reasonably expect an answer. He prays that the Christians at Collosse might stand *perfect* and *complete* in all the will of God; or in other words, that they might be perfectly and completely conformed to the whole will of God. Now what was the whole will of God in regard to them? Certainly not that they should continue to sin and give Him a divided heart. But that they should forsake all sin, and love Him with their whole heart. The original words rendered perfect and complete are very expressive. The former, τελειοι means perfect, complete. The verb from which it is derived means, to perfect—to make perfect—to complete. The other word, πεπληρωμενοι, is the passive participle of the verb πληροω, to fulfil—to perform fully—to complete—to perfect. In the passive, to be fully completed, or entirely conformed to, as in the passage before us. It can mean nothing less than complete conformity to the whole will of God; and this is nothing less than perfection.

There is another class of texts, in which a different word occurs in the original. This is καθαρίζω, (from καθαρος, pure,) to cleanse, to purify either from external impurities, or legally, or spiritually. The first passage we shall quote is 1 John i, 7–10, 'But if we walk in the light, as He is in the light, we have fellowship one with another, and the blood of Christ His Son *cleanseth us from all sin.* If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and *to cleanse us from all unrighteousness.* If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar, and the truth is not in us.' The meaning of the phrases 'cleanseth us from all sin,' and 'to cleanse from all unrighteousness,' is obvious. They imply an entire freedom from all sin. This is their literal import. And if the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, it will give us sinless perfection. It may be said that the 8th verse shows that we cannot be free from all sin: 'If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us.' But the 8th verse is explained by the 10th: 'If we say we *have not sinned* we make Him a liar,' &c. The phrase, 'If we say we *have no sin*,' of the 8th verse, is of the same import with that in the 10th, 'If we say we *have not sinned.*' The meaning of both is, if we say we are not sinners, and therefore have no need of the blood of Christ to cleanse us from our sins, then we deceive ourselves. The 8th and 10th verses refer to the state in which men are by nature, previous to the operation of Divine grace upon the heart, and not to that in which they must necessarily remain after it has operated. If any one say, that the expression 'the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin,' refers not to what takes place in this life, but to what will take place in a future life, he gives it an explanation which the context will by no means bear. The two expressions in the 7th verse, 'If we walk in the light,' and 'The blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin,' evidently refer to the same period of time. When ye walk in the light as He is in the light, then the blood of Christ will cleanse you from all sin. That the first clause of this verse 'If ye walk in the light,' refers to their walking in this life,

no one will deny. That the first consequence of this walking in the light, viz. 'Ye have fellowship one with another,' also occurs in this life will not be denied—and it is equally undeniable, that the second consequence, viz. the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin, will occur during the same period.

There is another text peculiarly strong, 2 Cor. vii, 1, 'Having therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us *cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit*, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.' 'All filthiness of the flesh and spirit,' includes all sins of every kind, and to be cleansed from all sins of every kind is to be entirely free from sin, or to attain sinless perfection. The expression 'perfecting holiness' proves two things. 1. That there may be holiness in the heart, which is not perfect or complete, and therefore overturns the opinion of those who hold that every Christian is perfect. For the text was addressed to Christians, and if they were already *perfect* in holiness, there would be no propriety in exhorting them *to make* their holiness perfect. 2. It shows that perfect holiness may be obtained; for it would be idle to exhort men to obtain or to seek that which is known to be unattainable. The verb of which perfecting is a participle means, to finish—to complete—to perfect. Now holiness cannot be finished—completed—perfected, while there is any unholiness remaining. The conclusion is unavoidable.

Again, 1 Thess. v, 23, 'And the very God of peace *sanctify you wholly*, and I pray God your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.' Here is a prayer of the apostle, and if it be not a prayer that the Thessalonian Christians might be *perfectly holy* before death, (which is meant by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,) I am utterly at a loss to know what it does mean, or what language can express such an idea. Is it said that this is merely the expression of a wish on the part of the apostle, without implying that the thing desired was attainable? Bating the absurdity or the profanity of the idea, that the apostle would pray for what he knew could not be obtained, the very next verse proves the incorrectness of such a supposition. For he adds, 'Faithful is He that calleth you, who *also will do it*.' Will do what? Certainly what the apostle had just prayed for, viz. *sanctify them wholly*, and preserve them blameless unto death. I see no possible way of evading this argument. He prays for their perfect sanctification in this life, and then says it will be done.

Henry's comment on this passage is worthy of a passing notice.—It is as follows: 'The things prayed for on the part of the Thessalonians are their sanctification—that God *would sanctify them wholly*, and their preservation, *that they might be preserved blameless*. He prays that they might be *wholly* sanctified; that the *whole man* might be *sanctified*; and then that the whole man, spirit, soul, and body might be preserved: or he prays that they might be *wholly* sanctified, more perfectly, for the best are sanctified but in part while in this world, and therefore we should pray for and press toward complete sanctification.' Now I would fain ask by what rule of interpretation Mr. Henry makes *wholly sanctified*, the *whole man sanctified*, which he four times repeats as the amount of the apostle's prayer, mean merely sanctified more perfectly, or sanctified only *in part*, which he says is all that the best

can attain while in this world. And still more remarkable does this appear, when immediately after he speaks of the apostle's 'comfortable assurance that God would hear his prayer.' Faithful is He who calleth you, who also will do it. Now what was the apostle's prayer. Henry has said four times that it was that they might be *wholly sanctified;* and here he says that he had a 'comfortable assurance that God would hear his prayer,' which the apostle directly asserts in verse 24. How is this consistent with the assertion that the best are sanctified but in part while in this world? And he says again, 'Therefore the apostle assures them that God would do what he (the apostle) desired.'—Whether this assurance amounted to a full certainty that they would be wholly sanctified in this life, or not, is of no consequence to our argument. It is certainly inconsistent with a knowledge or even a belief that they *could not* be wholly sanctified. To make this matter perfectly clear, we will state these propositions together.

1. The apostle prays that God would *wholly sanctify* the Thessalonian Christians. (See verse 23 and Henry's comment.)

2. He has 'comfortable assurance' that God would hear his prayer. (See verse 24 and Henry's comment.)

3. The conclusion according to Henry is, the *best are sanctified but in part* while in this world. Whether it be legitimate or not I leave others to judge.

Should it be objected that this reasoning would prove that all the Thessalonian Christians must have become perfect, which is highly improbable, I reply, 1. There is no such improbability in the case as will justify us in rejecting the plain sense of the apostle's words. And 2. Though he prays that they might be sanctified wholly, and has comfortable assurance that God will hear his prayer, yet it is obviously implied, if they will obey his injunctions and do their duty.

Again, 1 John ii, 5, 6, 'Whoso keepeth His word, in him verily is the love of God perfected: hereby we know that we are in Him. He that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked.' If the love of God is *perfected*, then there must be *perfect* love. Perfect love excludes sin, and these two points constitute perfection. The 6th verse is equally strong. 'He that saith he abideth in Him, ought himself also to walk even as He (Christ) walked.' Now how did Christ walk? Surely in perfect holiness, and no one can walk as He walked who does not live perfectly holy. *Ought* implies obligation; obligation supposes power to meet it. What a man ought to do he is guilty for not doing; but it is a palpable absurdity to suppose that a man is guilty for not doing that which he has no power to do.

Another argument is founded on one of the petitions in our Lord's prayer. 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.' How is God's will done in heaven? He is perfectly loved and perfectly obeyed. This is what He wishes of all His creatures. How then must it be done on earth, in order that this petition may be answered? Why He must here be perfectly loved and perfectly obeyed by every individual. In no other way can His will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Here then is a prayer given us by our Savior for *universal perfection* which many Christians are in the daily habit of using. In regard to it one of three things must be admitted.

1. It must be a prayer which may be offered in faith, and which consequently may be answered; and if so, perfection is attainable: or,

2. Our Savior intended by it to lead his disciples to believe what is not true, and to pray for that which He never intended to grant: or,

3. He intended they should offer a prayer which they did not believe, and to which they had no expectation of an answer. Which of these propositions is true, no one can long hesitate to determine.

But I have here an additional remark. Many of our opponents hold a belief in the doctrine of perfection to be a sin. At least *one** ecclesiastical body of our land has condemned it, as among the prominent heresies of the day. Here then comes a new difficulty. We are commanded by our Savior to pray for a certain object, and yet we are told that it is a sin to believe that object can be obtained. Can persons with such opinions offer such a prayer?

There is another class of passages, in which the verb καταρτίζω and its derivatives occur, which bears upon this doctrine. 'The proper original sense of the word is to compact or knit together either members in a body, or parts in a building.' (See Leigh in Parkhurst.) It thence comes to mean to perfect, to finish, to complete. Dr. Clarke, in his note on 2 Cor. xiii, 9, 'And this we wish, even your perfection,' has these remarks: 'The perfection or rejoicing which the apostle here wishes, is that which he refers to the state of the Church in its fellowship, unity, order, &c. And perfection in the soul is the same in reference to it, as perfection in the Church is to its order and unity. The perfection or rejoicing of the soul implies its purification, and placing of every faculty, passion, and appetite in its proper place; so that the original order, harmony, and purity of the soul may be restored, and the whole builded up to be a habitation of God through the Spirit.'

We shall give but two passages where the word occurs. Heb. xiii, 20, 21, 'Now the God of peace that brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ, that great Shepherd of the sheep, through the blood of the everlasting covenant, *make you perfect in every good work to do His will*, working in you that which is *well pleasing in His sight* through Jesus Christ.' The other passage is 1 Peter v, 10, 'But the God of all grace, who hath called us unto His eternal glory by Christ Jesus, after that ye have suffered awhile, make you *perfect*, establish, strengthen, settle you.'

Comment on these passages is hardly necessary. I know of no language that can more strongly express Christian perfection than that in the one first quoted. '*Make you perfect in every good work to do His will*,' &c. They are to be made *perfect* in *every* good work which God will have them do; God Himself working in them that which is *well pleasing* in His sight; which of course cannot be sin, or in any way mingled with sin.

We must here add a few words on the propriety of praying for that which we believe to be unattainable. Prayer to be acceptable must be offered in faith; not indeed with that full assurance which is included in the highest sense of that word, and which enables us to feel certain that our particular request will be granted. But we must believe that the thing for which we pray is possible and agreeable to the will of God, and we must have some ground to hope that our prayer will be

* Synod of S. C., in a paper entitled 'Substitute for the Act and Testimony.'

heard and answered. For example, a Christian prays for an impenitent friend. He knows not the arrangements of God in regard to that individual, or what will be his destiny. But he does know that it is the will of God that sinners should repent, and he has some ground of hope in this particular case. But should this friend die impenitent, giving the clearest evidence that he was lost, then he would feel that it was wrong to pray for him because he could have no hope, and consequently no faith, since it would appear manifestly contrary to the will and purpose of God to answer his prayer. Now could he previous to the death of that friend obtain evidence that he was given up of God to impenitence and final destruction—evidence that left no shadow of doubt, would it not be equally wrong to pray for him as in the former case? Every one sees that it would; and why? Because he believes it contrary to the will of God to grant his prayer. Now suppose on the other hand we are commanded to pray for a specified object—the conversion of the world for instance—would any one doubt that such an object could be accomplished, or that there was reasonable ground to hope that it would be accomplished? And is not the conclusion equally clear in regard to that petition of the Lord's prayer which we have already noticed, 'Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' or the prayer of Paul, 'The God of peace sanctify you wholly,' as it is in regard to the conversion of the world? And how God's will can be done on earth as it is in heaven, while all men, Christians as well as sinners, are continually sinning against Him and violating His will, I am unable to see. But on the principle of those who oppose the doctrine of perfection, we must not only pray ofttimes *without* faith, but *against* faith; we must pray for that which our creed requires us to disbelieve and regard as a heresy and a sin. Can this be right?

But what do Christians and Christian ministers in particular teach on this subject? Do they not exhort men to do *all* their duty—to avoid *all* sin, and love God with all their heart, mind, and strength? And if they see a brother offend, do they not feel bound to reprove him? Supposing that brother should urge in excuse what he had often heard his preacher advance—

'Why I am imperfect; I cannot be free from all sin; I cannot do all my duty; you must excuse some delinquencies.'

What would be the reply?

Methinks it would be—'You have *no* excuse for sin; you *can* do your duty; God commands you to love Him supremely, and you are guilty if you do not obey.'

'What!' replies the brother, 'are you a perfectionist?'

'O no; I mean'—(what does he mean?) 'I mean—you must strive to avoid all sin, and to do all your duty, though it is presumption to expect you can ever accomplish it here.'

'But after I have done the utmost that I can with the help of God, and fail in some points, am I still guilty?'

'O sir, after we have done all, we are unprofitable servants.'

'To be sure; but does *unprofitable* imply *guilt?* Your servant may become unprofitable through sickness; but is he *guilty* for being sick?'

'O sir, I see you are falling into the common error of measuring your duty by your ability.'

'Will you have the goodness, sir, to point out to me a *duty* which I cannot perform, and tell me upon what principle it is a duty?'

'You are commanded to love God with all your heart, and your neighbor as yourself; yet 'tis presumption to think you can do it.'

'This is singular. You have just reproved me for not keeping this commandment, and now you tell me that it is presumption to think I can keep it. If I *can* keep it, it is not presumption *to think* I can; if I *cannot*, why do you reprove me? But will you tell me, sir, how much of it I may expect to keep without being guilty of presumption?'

We might go on with this dialogue, and we believe our anti-perfection teacher would find himself involved in a variety of difficulties. It is impossible in regard to most minds to separate the idea of the impossibility of avoiding all sin, from that of justification in the commission of some sin. We know it is absurd to speak of being justified in the commission of sin, yet it is an absurdity to which the doctrine we are opposing almost necessarily leads. It becomes our opponents to relieve us from the embarrassment in which their principle involves us. According to them we sin in aiming too high, and we sin in aiming too low; it is presumption to expect too much, and it is want of faith to expect too little. *How much* then of our duty may we expect to perform, and be guiltless both of presumption and of neglect? Supposing that when our Savior repeated those commands on which hang all the law and the prophets, some by-stander had said to Him, 'Master, we know that your commands are just and holy, but I cannot obey them; 'tis presumption *to think* so,'—what would have been His reply?

But it may be said that though any one individual sin may be avoided, yet the whole series and for a course of years cannot. I recollect a remark of Coleridge to the same point. He advanced the objection, and brought forward an illustration to support it. I cannot now turn to the passage, neither do I precisely recollect the illustration, but I will give one somewhat like it and which will answer the same purpose. A blind man attempts to walk a narrow path between two precipices; he proceeds a few steps in safety; but it does not follow that he can continue for miles without deviating. No more, infers the philosopher, can the Christian refrain from sin all his life, though he may for a short time. True, but supposing the blind man were told that if he would make the effort and do the best he could, a friendly hand should be outstretched to direct and guide his steps with unerring accuracy, then, I say he would be able, and if commanded to do it, he would be guilty if he did not comply. So the Christian, though he cannot by his own strength merely walk the road of holiness, unscathed by sin, yet if he will put on the whole armor of God, and lean upon the Divine arm that is held out to him, he may, and blessed be God for the help.

We now proceed to some objections that may be urged against the views we are maintaining. We have already noticed some of the more formidable in our statement of the doctrine; but there are others which demand a brief notice.

The first is drawn from such passages of Scripture as these: 'There is no man that sinneth not,' 1 Kings viii, 46. 'For there is not a just man upon earth, that doeth good and sinneth not,' Eccl. vii, 20. Our own opinion in regard to these verses is, that they simply teach that no man passes through life without committing sin—not that every man must sin in every period of his life. They may have a potential sense, 'For there is no man that *may* not sin.' It would not be difficult to

show that the original words will bear this meaning, and the supposition which precedes the first of these texts seems to require it. *If* they sin against thee, (for there is no man that sinneth not.) *If* implies *contingency*, which is inconsistent with the *certainty* supposed to be contained in the parenthetic clause. *Should* they sin against thee, for perhaps every man will, &c. This makes it all consistent, though we prefer our first interpretation.

Examples from Scripture are often referred to for the same purpose. David sinned, and so did Peter. Granted, and what follows? Not that *they* even continued to sin all their lives, much less that all Christians will do so. We do not deny that Christians *may* sin; eminently holy men often have sinned, and a vast majority of the true followers of Christ are sanctified but in part. But it by no means follows that none can or do attain sinless perfection. If the examples of Scripture in which good men have fallen were ten times more numerous than they are, it would only prove what we do not deny, that the saints of God *may* have their sins.

But it is said this doctrine fosters spiritual pride, and lulls the soul into a deceitful security. I state the objection as I find it; I am not sure that I understand it. If it mean that the *belief* of the doctrine fosters spiritual pride, I think it evidently unfounded. For if the Christian believes that he can attain this perfection, he must believe that he *ought* to attain it; for every Christian knows that he should make the highest possible attainment in holiness. If then he believes he can be free from all sin, and yet feels that he is still cherishing sin in his heart, it will fill him with shame and humiliation rather than with pride. As soon should we expect that the voluptuary would be proud because he believes he can reform, or the sinner because he believes he can be a Christian, as that the Christian should be, because he believes he can be perfect. But if the objection refers to those who claim *to be* perfect, the question arises, Are their claims well founded? *be* they perfect or be they not? If they are not, I grant as readily as the objector that these pretensions, whether the persons are deceivers or self-deceived, will foster pride and lead into sin. But with such persons we have nothing to do. This very pride proves infallibly that they are not perfect. But the fact that there are hypocritical pretenders to perfection is no more objection to the doctrine itself, than the fact that there are hypocritical pretenders to piety is an objection to the common doctrine of experimental religion. While we preach that sinners should repent and be converted and lead holy lives, there will be some that make pretensions to godliness who are, and who know themselves to be, yet in the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity. And there will be others who imagine that they are serving God, while they are yet entangled in the meshes of Satan. But he would be thought a singular reasoner, who should hence pretend that it was dangerous to advocate the doctrine of experimental religion.—True piety in its lowest state is a foe to pride of every kind; much more so when it reaches perfection. What is pride but the offspring of a sinful heart? It is one of the elements of our *fallen* nature. Just in proportion as we put off the old man, subdue the carnal mind, and restore the lost image of God to the soul, will pride disappear. He who has made the greatest progress in holiness

will have the least pride, and he who is perfectly holy will be perfectly humble. He that is free from all sin is of course free from pride.

But it is asked, If perfection is attainable, why are there none who are perfect? On this question we shall make several remarks. In the first place, it takes for granted what we deny, viz. that none have reached perfection. There are those who say they are free from sin, and whose deep humility, godly lives, and self-denying labors in the cause of their Redeemer, leave no reason to doubt the truth of their pretensions. But these, it is said, are interested persons; they wish to support their doctrine, and therefore are not impartial witnesses. Just the same objection is brought against the witnesses of our Savior's miracles and resurrection. 'These,' says the infidel, 'are Christians; they are interested persons—party concerned; they wish to support their doctrine, and therefore are not competent witnesses. Let those who are free from this bias—who are not Christians, testify to the miracles, and I will believe.' Who does not see that this is impossible? The mind that admits the miracle admits the religion; and the very fact that he testifies to the resurrection of Christ, disqualifies him in the view of the infidel for being a competent witness. So in the case before us, an example is demanded of one who has attained perfect holiness. Examples are produced. 'These,' 'tis said, 'are dreaming fanatics; they believe the doctrine and wish to support it, therefore they are incompetent witnesses. Give us one who is not a perfectionist, and we ask no more.' Who does not see that this request is absurd. For one who denies that perfection can be attained, will not, of course, pretend that he has obtained it, and therefore can be no witness in the case. I repeat, therefore, there are those who claim to be perfect, and whose lives do not give the lie to their pretensions. These I offer as witnesses, and their testimony must stand as true, till it is proved to be false.

And these witnesses may be much more numerous than we suppose. Christian perfection is not a quality that will make a display in the world. It will not be proclaimed upon the house tops or at the corners of the streets. On the contrary, he that has reached it is perfectly humble, and seeks not the notice or applause of the world. His whole object is to do his duty to God and his fellow men, and to wait in joyful expectation for the coming of his Lord, and I doubt not but on that day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, many a Christian who was unknown or despised in the world, will be found to have lived even here without stain and without spot, the perfect image of his Lord.

But that the number of such is small, compared with the whole number of Christians, I do not doubt. It is a melancholy fact, but no more so than another fact, that even in Christian lands a great majority of those for whom Christ died, and who believe in the importance of a change of heart, live without God and without hope in the world.—Owing to the wickedness of the heart and the wiles of the adversary, few comparatively even of good men reach this state of perfection, till death is swallowed up in glory. There are two other reasons why so few become perfect. One is, few believe the doctrine. We cannot expect to see it exemplified till it is believed. The other is, most persons entertain wrong views of it. They suppose it implies something superhuman, and therefore are deterred from efforts to reach it, which they would make, were their views correct. But man is not required

to exercise the powers of an angel, or to possess the same degree of holiness as an angel, any more than he is required to know as much as an angel. As to the probability that any will reach this state, we can only say, if our views are correct, Christians can and ought to be perfect; they also have a prevailing desire to be perfect. Is it not probable that some of them will be perfect?

Thus have we endeavored to explain the doctrine of perfection, and present some of the more prominent Scriptural proofs. If we have done any thing to free it from objections and exhibit it in its true light, we shall be abundantly rewarded for our labor.

ON PREPARATION TO MEET GOD.

A SERMON BY THE REV. H. W. HILLIARD, A. M.,

Of the Alabama Conference.

'Prepare to meet thy God,' Amos iv, 12.

To comprehend the full force and spirit of this passage, we must examine those parts of the chapter with which it is immediately connected. It will be observed that the idolatry of the Israelites is severely rebuked; they are reminded of the terrible judgments which had been inflicted on them, and of their own singular incorrigibleness.

'And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. And also I have withholden the rain from you when there were yet three months to the harvest: and I caused it to rain upon one city, and caused it not to rain upon another city; one piece was rained upon, and the piece whereupon it rained not withered. So two or three cities wandered unto one city to drink water, but they were not satisfied: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have smitten you with blasting and mildew: when your gardens, and your vineyards, and your fig trees, and your olive trees increased, the palmer worm devoured them: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have sent among you the pestilence after the manner of Egypt: your young men have I slain with the sword, and have taken away your horses; and I have made the stink of your camps to come up unto your nostrils: yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord. I have overthrown some of you as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were as a firebrand plucked out of the burning; yet have ye not returned unto me saith the Lord. Therefore thus will I do unto thee, O Israel: and because I will do this unto thee, prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. For lo, He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of hosts is His name.'

There are two prominent thoughts suggested by this sublime controversy between God and His people. First, that the judgments of God are not vindictive, but that men by persisting in a course of transgression make it necessary that they should be punished.

Very unworthy conceptions of the character of God are sometimes entertained. There are many who take but a partial view of His ad-

ministration, and blind to the extended benevolence which characterizes it they condemn it as severe. They point to the expulsion from paradise, the deluge, the destruction of cities, the overthrow of nations, and other instances of the signal punishment of sin, as illustrations of their view. They look to the punishment, but they forget its philosophy.

God is benevolent: no truth can be clearer. The heavens above us declare it, and the earth beneath our feet teaches it. It is illustrated in that wide regard which embraces the universe in all its amplitude, diffusing life and preserving harmony throughout the worlds; and in that concern which we daily witness for the preservation of the humblest creatures that exist. Our Lord employed the sparrow and the lily as illustrations of this feature in the Divine character. In the sacred writings power is ascribed to God, and wisdom, and other qualities; but St. John declares that 'God *is* love.'

When then in viewing the Divine administration we discover instances of punishment and suffering, we must account for them upon some other principle, than to suppose that they result from a disposition in God to create unhappiness. The great tendency of the administration must be looked to; the relation which the beings who suffer sustain to others must be regarded.

That this view may be made clearer, let us examine some circumstances in the history of mankind which will serve to illustrate and enforce it. The history of the plagues which were sent on Egypt, is thought by some to furnish a very strong argument against the mercy of the Divine administration. We think that its testimony is of a directly opposite character. To appreciate these events properly, we must regard the moral and religious condition of Egypt at the time when they occurred. Idolatry of the grossest kind prevailed. It is said by an author, whom we shall call to our aid in remarking upon the miracles which were performed by Moses among the Egyptians, that though idolatry took its rise in Chaldea, 'Egypt seems to have become at a very early period tinctured with that vice, while in the extent to which they carried it, all ancient writers allow that no people can be brought into comparison with the Egyptians. That brute worship originated in Egypt, can we think be as little doubted, as that it gradually arose out of the use of hieroglyphical writing, and at all events we know that it was practised there to a degree in itself irreconcilable with common reason.'

Now it seems to us, that under these circumstances the introduction into Egypt of the Israelites, a people acquainted with the true God, must be recognized as a very favorable event for the Egyptians.—When it became necessary to remove the Israelites from the land of their bondage and degradation, the means employed to bring about this result were manifestly designed to benefit their oppressors by exposing the folly of their idolatry.

The first plague to which God condemned Egypt to submit, was the conversion of the waters into blood. This strange effect was produced by an instrumentality well calculated to lead them to a knowledge of God. Moses His servant barely smote the river with his rod.—This very remarkable circumstance would have astonished any people, but it had a special application to the condition of Egypt. The Nile, which gave fertility to their lands, was considered by the Egyptians a

god; and yet it is 'converted at the command of a servant of Jehovah into a substance which none of their priests could touch or even approach without pollution.'

The plague of the frogs succeeded this, another unavoidable source of pollution.

Then came the plague of the lice, and they were upon every man and beast throughout the land. 'Now if it is remembered that no man could approach the altars of Egypt on whom so impure an insect harbored, and that the priests to guard against the slightest risk of contamination wore only linen garments, and shaved their heads and bodies every day, the severity of this miracle as a judgment upon Egyptian idolatry may be imagined.'

While it lasted no act of worship could be performed, and so keenly was this felt, that the very magicians exclaimed, 'This is the finger of God.'

The same principle is traced in the fourth plague, of which one of their deities was made the instrument. Swarms of flies came upon all the land.

The fifth plague it is said struck at the root of the system of brute worship. It was the murrain among the cattle: 'Neither Osiris, nor Isis, nor Ammon, nor Pan, possessed power to save his representative; and the sacred bull, and ram, and heifer, and he-goat were swept away by the same malady which destroyed others.'

It is believed that the sixth plague was intended to rebuke the practice of offering human sacrifices. This was done to propitiate Typhon, or the evil principle. There are reasons for believing that these victims were selected from the Israelites. Moses, by the direction of Jehovah, approached the furnace where the victims were burned, and imitating the manner of the Egyptian priests, took a handful of the ashes, and casting them into the air, there came instead of a blessing boils and blains, peculiarly obnoxious upon all the people of the land. The inability of Typhon to protect his worshippers was thus shown.

In the seventh plague it is said that Isis the god of water, and Osiris the god of fire, were the instruments. Lightning and hail came with tremendous power upon the land, and the horror of the Egyptians may be imagined, when we remember 'that Egypt is blessed with a sky uncommonly serene, that in the greatest part of it no rain falls from one end of the year to the other, and that even in such districts as are watered from on high, a slight and transient shower is all that the inhabitants ever witness.'

The eighth plague was that of the locusts, and while in itself a serious evil, it demonstrated the inability of the gods Isis and Serapis to protect the land from their invasion.

In the language of the writer whose course we have mainly followed in viewing these miracles, 'The ninth plague was directed against that species of superstition, which, as it first broke in upon true religion, so it seems to have held throughout the highest place in the estimation of the heathen. Light, that great god of Chaldea, was shown to be a mere creature in the hands of the Most High, and both the sun and the moon were veiled during three days and nights from the eyes of their astonished worshippers.

'The tenth and most tremendous judgment of all was, as indeed it

is represented to be, a perfect application of the law of reprisal to the stubborn and rebellious Egyptians. "Thus saith the Lord, Israel is my son, even my first-born. Let my son go that he may serve me, and if thou refuse to let him go, behold I will slay thy son, even thy first-born." Before this threat was carried into execution, every effort had been made to subdue the obstinacy of Pharaoh. Judgment after judgment had been sent upon him and his subjects, by none of which were the children of Israel affected. His gods were shown to be no gods—his sacred river was made the source of defilement to him. The sun refused him its light, the locusts devoured his crops, yet none of all these things succeeded in convincing Pharaoh that Jehovah was supreme throughout the universe, and that it was his wisdom to obey. Then, and not till then, God raised his arm to strike, and the strength and the pride of Egypt perished in one night.'

In this whole controversy we think that the mercy of God was largely displayed.

The history of the Israelites will furnish farther illustrations of our view. It is well known that they were very early distinguished as the people of God, and were peculiarly blessed. The manifestations of the Divine regard for them were such as to attract the observation of other nations. By a direct and most remarkable display of power God delivered them from bondage; the waters retired at their approach and left them a sure passage for their hosts, and then overwhelmed their pursuers; a heavenly banner waved over them by day and by night, and guided them on their way; for them water gushed out of the rock, and food became abundant in the wilderness. In the red path of battle they were shielded, and the strength of nations was subdued before them. They enjoyed a glorious intercourse with the Almighty. His presence was with them, and His voice was heard in their midst; its still, clear tones proclaiming His loving kindness.

Now glance at the future history of this people. See them overtaken by calamities, visited with famine, the fertility of their lands destroyed, their beautiful places desolate, thousands sinking under the breath of pestilence, their young men slain with the sword, their strength in war vanquished, and their glory spoiled; hear them sighing in captivity, see them sitting in sadness upon the banks of strange rivers, far from their home and their temple; survey all the scenes of their wonderful history, and then ask, 'What has done all this?' Here is the arm of the Lord made bare against a people who were once cherished. Can it be imagined that the administration of the Almighty is capricious? This mighty change in the condition of the Israelites is to be accounted for upon principles very clear and equitable. It was the result of their own transgressions; the effect of that discipline which it is necessary for moral purposes, should be extended over all. Moses, the illustrious legislator of the Israelites, clearly predicted the sufferings of this people, and attributed them solely to their abandonment of duty. He represented to them how necessary it would be to punish rebellion, and while he promised as the reward of obedience, the largest blessings, he assured his people that their sins must bring upon them distressing calamities. What a melancholy sanction has history given to all that he uttered!

Why did the Israelites suffer from famine? That they might see

their folly in departing from the Lord, and return unto Him. This is to be learned from the 6th verse of the chapter from which we have selected our subject: 'And I also have given you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places, *yet have ye not returned unto me, saith the Lord.*' Had the object been accomplished, their calamities would have been arrested. Their fields would have smiled again, and put on their beauty afresh; they would have been blessed with plenty; their gardens, and vineyards, and fig trees, and olive trees would have been safe from the palmer worm; they would have been strangers to the pestilence after the manner of Egypt; their young men would have escaped the sword; their strength in battle would have remained undiminished; their country would not have been desolate.

Many other examples might be furnished which clearly exhibit the principle which we have said characterizes the Divine administration. We shall present one more—Nebuchadnezzar, the great king of Babylon. His vast possessions, his immense power, and the splendor which every where met his glance, had well nigh made him forget that there was a greater being than himself. His greatness is said to have reached unto heaven, and his dominion to the ends of the earth.—Kings were his vassals and tributaries. Egypt, Syria, Phœnicia, Arabia, swelled his wealth. He was a conqueror; the strength of his arms was acknowledged on the shores of the Euxine and Caspian seas, and to the Atlantic ocean.

Babylon 'the glory of kingdoms,' the city of palaces; Babylon, with its gates of brass, its magnificent temples, its hanging gardens—Babylon was his. His own grandeur and the fate which awaited him were pictured to him in a dream. He seeks an interpreter. The prophet of the Lord unfolds the vision, and urges him to break off his sins by righteousness, and his iniquities by showing mercy to the poor. But power, pomp, wealth, splendor, intoxicated him. He looked forth upon the glory of his kingdom, and he was dazzled. He walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon, he looked upon its beautiful architecture fashioned by his own taste; the city in its glorious splendor was at his feet, and as he gazed upon it, and the voices of the thousands who owned his sway broke upon his ear, his heart swelled with a lofty pride, and he exclaimed, 'Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom, by the might of my power and for the honor of my majesty?' In that very hour an unearthly voice fell upon the ear of the king of Babylon, saying, 'The kingdom is departed from thee.' He was driven from men; his dwelling was with the beasts of the field. Years passed away, and at length Nebuchadnezzar rose up from his degradation, a wiser and a better man. He lifted his eyes to heaven, his understanding was restored, and he blessed the Most High.

These reflections will, we trust, be sufficient to persuade us that the judgments of God are not vindictive; but that the object contemplated even in the infliction of heavy punishment upon men, is their own true happiness. It is true the history of mankind unfolds sad scenes, but these may be traced to *sin;* this 'brought death into the world and all our wo.'

It is for no idle purpose that the wrath of the Almighty goeth forth

as a tempest—that nations are overthrown—the proudest and oldest institutions prostrated—one king pulled down and another raised up. The unseen Spirit of the Most High is there, bringing order out of confusion, educing good from evil. War, pestilence, famine, these are but instruments directed by an invisible but mighty arm. Let us look around us. Are there no judgments now to be observed upon the earth? Have they exerted their proper influence upon us?

There is a disease which taking its rise in an idolatrous country has invaded nation after nation, until it hath been named 'the scourge of nations:' it hath spared neither age nor sex—it hath not respected rank or power—but clad in gloom, and followed by lamentation and weeping, it hath gone on pushing its conquest of death wider and wider. Have we not shared in public calamities? Have we suffered no private bereavements? Hath the hand of the Lord been upon us, and have we not yet returned unto Him? Let us be warned by the fate of others not to persist in rebellion until the fearful admonition comes to us from insulted Heaven, 'Prepare to meet thy God.'

The second thought suggested by this subject is, that when the object contemplated by the judgments of God is not accomplished, those who have been subjected to them must prepare to meet God as an enemy.

The message to the Israelites, upon which we are now remarking, is manifestly in the style of a challenge, and a sublime and unequalled description of the power of their great adversary is given in the succeeding verse. They are told to expect Him to come in His strength and take vengeance upon them, and they are called on to consider whether they are able to contend with Him.

Under this view let us consider the subject. That every man must meet God is certain. Reason and revelation both teach this. It will be sufficient here to remark, that it is declared by St. Paul in his epistle to the Corinthians, that 'We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.'

That the hopeless nature of the controversy between God and His impenitent people may be fully perceived and felt, let us pursue the view of this subject presented by the prophet. No where have we met with any thing more sublime: 'Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel. For lo, He that formeth the mountains and createth the wind, and declareth unto man what is his thought, that maketh the morning darkness, and treadeth upon the high places of the earth, the Lord, the God of hosts is His name.'

For lo, He that formeth the mountains. How forcibly does this represent the strength of God; He that formeth the *mountains*. Compare these with the works of man. How long does it occupy his skill, and industry, and strength to construct poor improvements and accomplish little objects—and these presently decay. But God throws a vast chain of mountains over a whole continent, and there they stand everlasting monuments of strength, witnessing the passing away of generations, and the destruction of empires. Man with difficulty ascends their steep sides, and standing upon their brow looks out upon plains and cities and rivers beneath his feet. He that formeth the mountains!

And createth the wind. Not only is His power displayed in forming works of grandeur which frown upon the littleness of man and defy his strength—but He controls those things which are subtile and unseen; which elude his grasp and baffle his skill. The wind—what an instrument in the hands of God! See the tempest as it sweeps over the earth in its unmeasured strength—prostrating forests—destroying cities—hurling into ruin the proudest works of man: or, as it turns its terrible power upon the great deep, scattering mighty fleets, sporting with

> 'Armaments, which thunder-strike the walls
> Of rock-built cities,'

rolling the billows mountain high against the resounding shore, and dashing the frail ship in pieces as a potter's vessel.

And declareth unto man what is his thought. He reads the veiled secrets of the heart; he penetrates the thoughts and purposes of artful man. Against the Almighty no policy can prevail; all skill is baffled. What an adversary is this! In the conflicts of human life prudence and enterprise are worth much, but in contending with God their power is lost.

That maketh the morning darkness. See the shades of night retiring,

> 'For yonder comes the glorious king of day,
> Rejoicing in the east.'

The earth rejoices under his brightness; the birds are abroad with their songs, and men go forth to the business of life. Over half a world the glorious light is spread out, and the cheerful voice of life is heard. But lo, the Almighty arm is stretched forth—the sun is driven back in his course—his splendor is veiled—darkness falls upon the earth like a pall—nature is hushed, and men grope their way in thick night. What a sublime strength is here displayed by the adversary of frail man. This may be understood too to mean that upon the glory of life's young morning, He can bring the darkness of disappointment and despair.

And treadeth upon the high places of the earth. It is believed that what is mainly intended by this is, that God is above all earthly distinctions; that the great and the mighty, and the poor and the humble, the king and the beggar, the palace and the hovel are alike to Him; that He treadeth upon the proud, and vanquisheth the strong, and overthroweth fortified places.

The Lord. The ruler—He whom all things obey, whose empire is boundless.

The God of hosts is His name. How striking is this; hosts are at his command. Look abroad; strive to calculate the number of worlds which almighty power has created. Call in the aid of science and you are overwhelmed with the immensity of the contemplation. Added to the number with which science is acquainted, there must be a multitude undiscovered. In the language of Dr. Chalmers, 'What is seen may be nothing to what is unseen: for what is seen is limited by the range of our instruments. Though this earth and these heavens were to disappear, there are other worlds which roll afar; the light of other suns shines upon them; and the sky which mantles them is garnished with other stars.' He illustrates his thought finely: 'The universe at large would suffer as little in its splendor and variety, by the destru ction

of our planet, as the verdure and sublime magnitude of a forest would suffer by the fall of a single leaf.'

Over all the mighty population of these countless worlds the power of God extends. How utterly hopeless then, must be a controversy with Him whose resources are so ample, who can call up from every world hosts to swell the ranks of His mighty army.

Who can meet God as an enemy? If we remain impenitent, as an enemy He must be met: the frail strength which we possess must conflict with the power of the Almighty.

What then is the part of wisdom? A king goes forth with an army of ten thousand; he spreads out his force in battle array; he awaits the hour of conflict which is to decide his destiny. Presently the sound of approaching hosts is borne upon the air and breaks upon his attentive ear, and upon a distant height he sees many banners waving, and the gleam of a hundred thousand spears. The report comes to him that his force is vastly outnumbered, and that all is lost. Does he await the coming of his foe, and expose his people to certain ruin? If he is wise, in the language of our Lord, while the other is yet a great way off, he sendeth an embassy and desireth conditions of peace.

Let us imitate this wisdom. Let us meet God as penitents who need mercy. Then all the power He wields is exerted in our behalf, and as we look forth upon the heavens and the earth, and contemplate the countless worlds which move in their ample sweep about the throne of God, and survey the mighty benevolence which breathes through all and blesses all, we shall exclaim, 'The Lord reigneth, let the earth rejoice; let the multitudes of isles be glad thereof.'

From the Wesleyan Methodist Magazine.

MEMOIR OF THE LATE REV. JAMES TOWNLEY, D. D.

BY THE REV. ELIJAH HOOLE.

The name of the late Rev. James Townley, D. D., is justly dear to an extensive circle of surviving relatives and friends; it is held in affectionate remembrance by many thousands in the Wesleyan Methodist societies of which he was, from early life, a member and a minister; and it is known and respected by many beyond that community, in consequence of the interesting works which he published, and the services which he rendered, by his industrious researches, to the cause of learning in general, and to the lover of Biblical literature in particular.

Of such a character it would be desirable to have a lengthened memoir. Many are the valuable lessons it would suggest. A history of increasing experience in personal religion, and of a holy walk with God; of a ministerial career, whose precious results were the conversion of many souls from sin to holiness, and increase and edification to the Church; and of that diligent study which, notwithstanding the unavoidable and frequent interruptions of numerous official avocations, was rewarded with an extensive knowledge of ancient ecclesiastical history, and a familiar acquaintance with Biblical criticism; could not fail to be instructive to all the followers of Christ, encouraging to the

junior laborers in the same vineyard, and deeply interesting to such as, under similar circumstances, are not unmindful of the pleasures and toils of literary pursuits.

It is therefore regretted that materials for such a memoir do not exist. Dr. Townley left no connected record of the circumstances of his life; and it is to the recollections cherished by his friends, and a reference to his works, that we are chiefly indebted for the following particulars.

James Townley was born of respectable parents in Manchester, May 11th, 1774. His father, Mr. Thomas Townley, was in extensive business. His mother, a very sensible woman, was a regular attendant at the services of the established Church, and an occasional hearer at the evening services in the Methodist chapel. Her maternal faithfulness and affection were eminently conspicuous in the sedulous attention she paid to the best interests of James, her youngest child. The influence of this excellent parent's example and counsel was happily successful. Filial love and religious feelings were observable traits in the character of her beloved son even in infancy; and when, as a youth, his thoughtless associates had carried him to the fascinating amusements of the theatre, her advice sufficed to induce him, at once and for ever, to renounce a gratification, which with a boyish folly he had persuaded himself was both innocent and beneficial.

The care of his education was entrusted for some years to the late Rev. David Simpson, of Macclesfield: after his death he was continued at the school of his curate, where he was instructed in some departments of classical literature, and passed through the usual routine of an English education.

Mr. Townley's early religious impressions were powerfully reawakened by the solemn services connected with the funeral of the Rev. David Simpson, and particularly by the address then delivered; an event which he frequently alluded to in after life, and generally with deep emotion. He returned from the school in Macclesfield to Manchester, and became a member of the Methodist society. His course in the Christian life was evidently progressive: 'the spirit of bondage unto fear,' painfully disclosing to him the corruption of his nature, and the sinfulness of his life, was succeeded by the 'Spirit of adoption,' which bore testimony to his believing heart of his interest in the redemption by the Lord Jesus Christ, effecting in him also that new and spiritual character which fitted him for the service of his Divine Master in whatever sphere of life he might be called to move.

The consistency of his religious profession and the gravity of his deportment, at this early period, may be concluded from the circumstance, that in his seventeenth year he introduced family prayer into his father's house with the entire approval of his parents; and when about nineteen years of age he began to labor as a local preacher in Manchester and its immediate neighborhood, under the direction of the venerable Alexander Mather.

He did not enter upon this important work without much anxiety and serious reflection. He was greatly apprehensive of self-deception, and feared to run before he was sent; but his path brightened before him; the ministry of the 'word of reconciliation' became his

delight; with much prayer, and entire dedication to God, he gave himself to the work of the Lord.

With a view to the direction of his future life, he had been placed in the house of an eminent cotton merchant in Manchester. His employer was a good and benevolent man, of another denomination of Christians, who knew how to estimate his integrity and piety; and under such auspices, the prospects of Mr. Townley, in that metropolis of commerce and wealth, may be considered encouraging. But Providence had marked out for him another course. His employer, when informed by him that he was about to quit his service to become an itinerant preacher in the Methodist connection, replied that he would not readily have consented to part with him for any other cause; and either then, or at an immediately subsequent interview, he generously presented him with one hundred pounds, for the purchase of books, as a token of his regard.

In his twenty-second year, Mr. Townley was received on probation as a travelling preacher by the Wesleyan Methodist conference. From this time till the year 1832, when by a failure of health he was compelled to retire, a period of six-and-thirty years, he continued, with uniform consistency and increasing honor, to fulfil his duties as a minister, and to occupy some of the most important offices of the connection to which he belonged.

Without particularly mentioning the different circuits to which he was successively appointed, it is sufficient to say, that many persons in each of them have in remembrance his intelligent and faithful ministry, tempered as it was with tenderness and discretion. In several instances his wise counsel and conciliatory deportment rendered him successful, under the Divine blessing, in allaying some degree of uneasiness which had been excited in the societies under his pastoral care. The advantages resulting from his wise and gracious ministry in Stockport are well remembered. In Warrington, during his stay, the chapel was enlarged, and the society greatly increased; the debt which had burdened the society was also considerably reduced. In Bradford he saw a revival of the work of God, and under the date of January 19th, 1826, he writes, 'Mr. T. H. Walker and I met some of the persons who have received good during the revival: seventy-six were present, who professed to enjoy the blessing of entire sanctification; and more than forty to have received a sense of justification. It was a most blessed time. Glory be to God alone.' Many indeed were the seals of his ministry; even after he was laid aside by affliction his heart was sometimes made to glow with gratitude, and his eyes to fill with tears, by the intelligence of one and another who had been brought to God under his ministry, and by his visitation of the sick in past years, when he had not been immediately acquainted with the fruit of his labors.

The life of a Methodist preacher, attentive to the great business of his calling, is at all times one of much exertion; his Sunday ministrations, and his daily engagements in the pulpit and at the bedside of the afflicted, throughout an extensive circuit, make large demands on his mental and physical energies. Mr. Townley found this to be the case in his own experience; yet, by economy of time, and by persevering diligence, he successfully cultivated sacred literature; and pre-

sented to the world several publications of considerable merit and value; beside those occasional compositions, which do not bear his name, some of them having only a temporary or local interest.

In addition to the advantages of education, Mr. Townley had received the impulse arising from early literary associations. While in Manchester he had become a member of a Philological Society, originated by the late Dr. Adam Clarke; and, in common with many other young men, was urged, by the example and exhortations of that celebrated scholar, to great diligence in the pursuit of knowledge, the fruits of which were seen throughout his future course. His first publication of note was a volume of 'Biblical Anecdotes,' which appeared in the year 1814. He had been desired by his children to preach them a sermon on the history of the Holy Scriptures, and on the early translations of them into different languages. As he found that they and others were delighted with the facts he had collected and arranged for their information, he yielded to the farther request of his family, and prepared the volume already mentioned. In the Methodist Magazine for that year, it is said, that 'the work abounds with important and interesting matter, well digested and well expressed, and contains proper references to the authorities by which the historic facts recorded in it are supported.'

The work which next proceeded from his pen was one which procured to him considerable celebrity in the literary and religious world. Appearing about seven years after the publication of his 'Biblical Anecdotes,' it affords striking evidence that he continued his diligent researches into ecclesiastical history and sacred criticism, with unabated ardour. It was entitled 'Illustrations of Biblical Literature, exhibiting the History and Fate of the Sacred Writings, from the earliest period to the present century, including notices of translators and other eminent Biblical scholars.'

It was no small tribute to its worth, that a review of it, for the Methodist Magazine, was written by one of the most accomplished Biblical scholars of the present day. He thus describes it:—'These volumes present a connected view of the history of Biblical translations from the earliest date to the present century, and are enriched by most copious and interesting biographical notices of the most eminent scholars and critics, and such occasional sketches of the history of the manners and superstitions of the darker ages, as may illustrate the advantages to be derived from a more general dissemination of the inspired writings.'

The magnitude and extent of the research required in the compilation of this elaborate work can only be fully appreciated by those who have been engaged in similar pursuits. Many volumes had to be read, in some cases, for the composition of a single page, and those volumes in old monkish Latin or in obsolete French. To ascertain a date, it was often necessary to search and compare many writings of his predecessors; and frequently had he to suspend his proceedings for several weeks, while waiting for books to be sent from Germany or other parts of the continent, to establish facts not otherwise to be correctly ascertained. His residence for several years in the neighborhood of Manchester greatly favored his design, by affording him free and constant access to the collegiate library in that town; an

establishment so rich in ancient Biblical literature, that, when the late Archbishop of Dublin was compiling his work on the Atonement, he resided several weeks in Manchester for the sole purpose of having uninterrupted reference to the books there deposited.

The literary excellence of Mr. Townley's erudite and valuable work was acknowledged in almost every respectable periodical of the day; and procured for him from an American university the well earned honor of the degree of Doctor in Divinity; an honor equally creditable to those who conferred it, and to him who received it. He was considered by most literary men as happy in the choice of a subject on which to employ his industry and embody its results. He delighted in his task; and subsequent to the publication of his work in three volumes, pursued the same subject with so much diligence, as to amass a quantity of most interesting information equal to one of the preceding volumes, which it was his design to incorporate with his work in a second impression, and which, by the adoption of a smaller type, he purposed to compress into two volumes. Many were the communications he received complimentary to his talents. On his visit to Ireland, as president of the conference, in the year 1830, he was congratulated by several members of the Dublin University, and the highest encomiums were pronounced on his performance. The whole of the first edition having been sold, all the preachers of the Methodist conference in Ireland gave their names as subscribers to a second edition, the publication of which would have proved generally acceptable, and was called for by many; but his circumstances did not warrant him, however desirous, to venture on a speculation so extensive; the additional matter, therefore, still remains in manuscript.

Doctor Townley was not insensible to the commendations bestowed upon his work; nor was he unmindful of the credit reflected by it on the body of Christians with which he was connected. Had he written solely for fame, he might have been content to desist from farther authorship; but he still continued his literary pursuits in the same useful direction. In 1824 he published a volume of 'Essays on various subjects of Ecclesiastical History and Antiquity.' Several of these elegant compositions had previously appeared in the Methodist Magazine and other periodicals; yet the volume was well received. It contains much curious information concerning the early corruptions of the patriarchal religion, and on the subject of Christian antiquities, not to be found collected together in any other book in the English language.

The next contribution of Dr. Townley to the literature of his country was a translation into English of the '*More Nevochim* of Maimonides; or, Reasons for the law of Moses,' with prefatory dissertations and appended notes, displaying considerable acquaintance with Jewish learning, and the results of much patient research. Rabbi Ben Maimon was a Jewish physician of great literary note in the thirteenth century. It appears to have been his object to show that many of the ceremonial precepts of the Mosaic institution were rational and just, independently of the spiritual meaning which may be conveyed by them. His book does not assume a controversial form; and perhaps was not intended as an attack on Christianity, but rather to embody

certain illustrations of the Levitical code, for the information of such Jews as might be curious in matters of their law. It was a boon to the world to present in an English dress a book so constantly referred to by Biblical critics, and without which no library of Scripture criticism can be considered complete. For the composition of the doctor's own portion of this volume, the best authors were consulted; the essays and notes are drawn up with great judgment and clearness, and drew forth the most gratifying commendations from high and respectable quarters. But works merely critical rarely acquire sudden popularity; they are but slowly introduced to the library of the studious; it takes time and frequent reference to discover their value. The doctor had experience of this in the sale of this volume, which is yet only partially known; and it is not improbable, that the disappointment arising from this circumstance prevented the desired appearance of the second edition of his 'Illustrations of Biblical Literature.'

Doctor Townley's last publication was an 'Introduction to the critical study of the Old and New Testaments,' embodying much of that correct and interesting information which his peculiar taste and reading had rendered familiar to him. This volume has been very widely circulated, and is much admired. It is fully worthy of the piety and talents of its author. The book of God was his favorite study, and the productions of his pen chiefly tended to aid those who love to follow him in tracing its interesting history, and are desirous to understand its sacred contents.

In 1826 Dr. Townley removed from Bradford to London, and was associated with three others in the pastoral care of the Queen-street circuit; and at the conference of 1827 he was appointed to the onerous and responsible office of general secretary to the Wesleyan Missionary Society. In this capacity he maintained the reputation of his previous life. His colleagues found him amiable and affectionate; he was ready for every public service; and he willingly bore a due share of the heavy responsibility connected with the management of the important interests of the society at home and abroad; while the missionaries found in him a faithful and wise counsellor and an unvarying friend.

Connected with the missions, he entertained a wakeful solicitude for their welfare, and indulged a grateful exultation at their success.—Yet he almost necessarily took that view of the spread of Christianity which his reading and previous pursuits were calculated to suggest.—He projected a History of Christian Missions, to embrace all the important facts on record, in every language, relating to any mission of whatever Church, for the conversion of mankind to the knowledge and faith of Christ:—a work which, if successfully executed, would have possessed uncommon interest and value. It would have brought out of obscurity the names of many who, in ancient times, were highly honored of God in the instruction and moral subjugation of many savage and pagan tribes of Europe, as well as of Africa and Asia; it would have edified the Church by memorials of the most active piety and patient zeal; it would have afforded the best means for comparing the modes of operation and the success of ancient and modern missions; and would have placed in striking contrast the missions of nominal Churches, merely political in their bearing and character, with

those which have their origin in Christian zeal, and whose object is the glory of God in the salvation of the souls of men.

When Dr. Townley's habits of research and practised ability in the examination of ancient records are considered, and the facts already stored in his memory by extensive reading, and the friendly terms of correspondence with which he was favored by one of the librarians of the Vatican, and by other literati at home and abroad, as well as the constant communication he held with missionaries in every part of the world, it cannot but be regretted very deeply, that, while holding the office of secretary to the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, he had not leisure to carry his projected work into effect; and that, after he had retired from the labors of public life, his state of health never permitted him to resume those habits of arduous literary toil which he had formerly cultivated, and which were necessary to the accomplishment of so laborious and comprehensive an undertaking. Under the effects of a distressing and debilitating indisposition, and with the disadvantage of an entire exclusion from his own library, being then in temporary lodgings in Ramsgate for the recovery of his health, he drew up a very interesting sketch of the history of some of the most remarkable missions of the Christian Church, ancient and modern, which was first read in part at a meeting of the Local Branch Missionary Society, and afterward adorned the pages of some successive numbers of the Methodist Magazine for the year 1834; affording, however, but a faint idea of what the projected work would have been, had circumstances favored its execution.

At the conference held in Sheffield, July and August, 1829, Dr. Townley was elected to the chair; and thus received the highest honor Methodism confers, and the most decided proof of the confidence and love of his brethren in the ministry.

His even piety, his amiable mildness, and his usual ability, were as conspicuous while he held the office of president of the conference as they had been in a more private station. He was equally beloved and respected; his official visits to various parts of the connection were seasons of great religious enjoyment to those with whom he was called to associate, a remembrance of which is gratefully cherished in many hearts. The year of his presidency was one of great peace, and of some enlargement to the Methodist society. The writer of this memoir had the privilege of being associated with Dr. Townley at the Mission House, for the whole of that year, and can personally testify the sacred anxiety with which he regarded every interest of the connection at home and abroad, and his daily attention to the various duties of his office.

Before the close of this year of honorable labor, Dr. Townley's health began seriously to decline. By the preceding British conference he had been appointed to preside at the Irish conference of 1830. With this object he proceeded to Dublin in the month of June; and during his stay his attention to business was almost incessant; while his sterling character, his pleasing manners, and his interesting conversational powers, had the effect of endearing his society not only to the preachers assembled in conference, but also to the literary, intelligent, and pious, of every rank and denomination to whom he was introduced. It would appear, however, that his exertions were greater than

his constitution was fitted to sustain. On his return to England he proceeded to Leeds, to preside, in the course of his official duty, at the committees preparatory to the conference then about to assemble; but it became apparent that he was struggling against pain and exhaustion; and when he was relieved by the election of his successor, it was found necessary to take medical advice, and for the present to avoid farther exertion.

From this period his constitution never fully recovered its tone: for two additional years, however, he retained the laborious office of secretary to the missions; but retired as a supernumerary at the conference of 1832, when it was apparent that his days could only be prolonged by a total cessation from the cares and business of public life.

For this event his mind had been prepared by the painful and alarming character of his indisposition, which had been increasing for several months, and by the consequent inability to take the whole of his duties as secretary; yet it cannot be imagined that he was removed from a work of so much interest and responsibility, to a station of comparatively useless retirement, without deep emotions of heart.—But he laid himself in the dust before God, and acknowledged that, after he had done all, he was an unprofitable servant.

In the autumn of 1832 he removed from London to Ramsgate; and when settled there, resuming his privilege as a private member of society, he united himself to a class, and received his quarterly tickets with thankfulness. In the holy communion of this little Christian assembly, of which for a short time before his decease he became the leader, he was accustomed to express himself in terms so humble and self-abasing as to excite the admiration and love of those who listened to him; and afforded a practical instance of the combination of exalted attainments in spiritual knowledge with true lowliness of heart.

Soon after his removal to Ramsgate the more distressing symptoms of his complaint in some measure subsided; his spirits resumed a cheerful tone, and a partial recovery of his strength encouraged the indulgence of hope that he might yet be spared many years to his family and to the Church. He preached once in Ramsgate without experiencing any extraordinary weariness or other inconvenience; he afterward visited Margate, and preached at the anniversary of the Missionary Society. The exertion, however, proved to be too great for his strength; he relapsed into a state of severe pain and great debility, from which he never afterward recovered.

Meantime his spirit was evidently ripening for the holy society of heaven; he possessed his soul in patience, and his mind was graciously supported. Toward the close of his last illness his symptoms became very distressing, and his sufferings were extreme; but his confidence in God was unshaken; he reposed on the satisfaction of Christ, and, rejoicing in the hope of everlasting life through Him, he could even 'glory in tribulation also.' His sufferings terminated December 12th, 1833, when he died in great peace, and in the full triumph of faith. He was in the sixtieth year of his age.

Dr. Townley was twice married. His first union with Miss Mary Marsden, of London, had a happy continuance of nearly thirty years, and was eminently conducive to his domestic happiness, and to his

usefulness in the Church of God. He had a mind very susceptible of social enjoyment; and therefore deeply felt the loss of his deservedly much beloved wife. At the time of her decease they had seven surviving children; their eldest son, a youth of much piety and of promising talent, having died before her, to the great grief of his parents, at the age of twenty-two.

He entered a second time into the marriage state with Miss Dinah Ball, of London; a lady well able to appreciate his character. It was her mournful gratification to minister to his comfort in his declining health, and to smooth his passage to the grave. She and his children are now left for a season to sorrow over a painful bereavement, and a temporary separation from one who must always live in their dearest affections. But they 'sorrow not as those without hope;' they rejoice in the glorious state of their departed relative: in his life and death they have an example bright and attractive, urging on them an additional incentive and encouragement to be 'followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises.'

Dr. Townley possessed naturally an excellent disposition, which, sanctified and exalted by the power of Divine grace, rendered him truly amiable. In all the domestic and social relations of life he was an object of affection to a degree not ordinarily attained; while the judgment which tempered the disinterested tenderness of his character procured for him reverence, as well as love, from those who composed the circle of his own family. His daughter Ann says, 'The beauty of my dear father's home character could never be fully appreciated by those who had not come under its influence. In all the common occurrences of life he displayed a refinement of feeling, and a delicacy of consideration for the feelings of others, that is rarely met with. His friends knew him to be kind, generous, and sympathizing; but they little knew how tenderly affectionate, how free from every selfish thought, his family found him. During his last indisposition there was a rapidly maturing spirit strikingly evidenced in his manner of conducting family worship. His prayers, at all times characterized by child-like simplicity, became, during his long and painful illness, so full of faith and fervor, so evidently recognizing the gracious intentions of his heavenly Father in taking the seat of the refiner, that many times have we risen from our knees with the overwhelming conviction that the furnace had not been heated in vain, that the silver was purged from the dross, and the process would prove a final one. In the midst of the most intense agony there was a calm and holy reposing on the bosom of his Savior that told to all that patience had had her perfect work. If pain and spasm wrung from him an involuntary indication of suffering, it was invariably followed by an acknowledgment of the hand that moved the rod. The emphasis with which at such moments he would say, "My Father!" "My Sanctifier!" I shall never forget.—At other times he would exclaim, "O take me home, take me home!" and then, with watchful jealousy lest he should encroach upon the supremacy of his Redeemer's will, he would add, "But not my will, not my will, but thine, be done; when thy work is accomplished; at thine own appointed time;" with other expressions of the like nature.'

In his intercourse with general society he affected not the high bearing which sometimes clings to men of age and reputation: the young

as well as the mature sought the pleasure of his cheerful and instructive conversation; the afflicted were often soothed by his attentions and sympathy; and to all his countenance was the index of a kind and peaceful heart, the seat of the truest philanthropy, because under the influence of Divine love.

His character as a Christian was remarkably uniform and consistent. He had high views of what the follower of Christ should be; his aim was to imitate and follow his heavenly Master. In the regulation of his own daily conversation and conduct he was eminently successful. His kindness of heart did not render him insensible to sin in others; but in reproving a fault, he united delicacy with faithfulness in such a manner as seldom to fail in producing the desired effect, and in making an indelible impression.

His literary acquirements gave him great advantage as a minister of the word of God; often furnishing him with happy illustrations of Divine truth new to his hearers, and serving, with a faithful application, to fasten it permanently in their memories and hearts. The language of his public ministrations, though strictly extemporaneous, was always chaste and good; and if his sermons did not bear the traces of ingenuity which distinguish the pulpit eloquence of some eminent men, it is sufficient to remark that they had the excellence of a clear exposition of Scripture doctrine, and a judicious selection from those stores of knowledge which proved him to be a scribe well instructed in the Gospel of the kingdom, bringing from his treasures things new and old. The only sermon he ever prepared for the press is to be found in a volume of sermons by various Wesleyan ministers, published at the conference office in 1833: it treats on his favorite subject, is written in an elegant style, and is fully worthy of the place it occupies among the admirable sermons of which the volume is composed.

But in no circumstances did his character shine with greater lustre than in affliction. For the last few years of his life he was a subject of many severe trials, personal and domestic. Every member of his family recollects the tenderness of his sympathy, and the unwearied kindness of his attentions, when sickness was allowed to visit them. Many times in the day, on some occasions, with his dearest earthly friend, would he approach the throne of grace; on the reception of painful tidings he would seek his aid in God, and having committed the matter to his heavenly Father, he would unhesitatingly say, 'Thy will be done.' His resignation, and his unwavering confidence in God, had much influence even on his literary character: some of his most valued writings were composed while affectionately watching, through the silent night, the sick bed of his late afflicted wife. The same cheerful confidence predominated during his own afflictions: for many years he suffered from a periodical head-ache, which usually made it necessary for him to stand nearly four-and-twenty hours in a leaning position against the wall, and occurred about every fortnight; but, under this suffering, and during his last painful and protracted illness, he never murmured, but was entirely resigned to the Divine will. The heat of the furnace did not consume, but only refine and brighten, his excellencies. In him was seen a practical illustration of the reasonableness of 'glorying in tribulation also.' And in contemplating such instances of the sufficiency of Divine grace in the extreme trials of human

nature, we learn the moral effect of that doctrine of Christianity he so cordially embraced, 'That the sufferings of the present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us.' To conclude: ascribing all the honor to the abounding mercy and grace of God, we exhibit the Christian character of the subject of this memoir as an example worthy to be emulated, and coincide with the sentiment expressed by the writer of a review of one of the doctor's valuable works, that 'such men as Dr. Townley are ornaments to human nature.'

PROFESSOR STUART'S ESSAY.

THE following Essay was written last September, in reference to a premium offered by the executive committee of the Revival Tract Society, for 'a tract on the question, What is the duty of the Churches in regard to the use of fermented (alcoholic) wine in celebrating the Lord's Supper?' The writer received, soon after the question was proposed to the public, a special request from some one connected with the proposal, as he has a right to presume, (although the letter was anonymous,) that he would write upon this question. Accordingly he wrote, and his piece was handed in to the depository named in the proposals, early last October. Before it was sent, it was read to some friends in Albany, deeply engaged in promoting temperance measures, in order to see whether the sentiments were such as they embraced and were willing to defend. Those friends were pleased to signify their approbation of the sentiments contained in the piece. Immediately after this it was sent to the depository, and after lying there for nearly seven months, and nothing being said to the public respecting any determination of the committee who were to judge of the merits of the pieces sent in, it was, at the request of the friends in Albany and in accordance with the express desire of the writer, withdrawn from the depository, in order to be published.

This statement is not designed in any measure to inculpate the committee of adjudication, the depository, or the executive committee of the Tract Society; for the writer is wholly ignorant of the circumstances which led to such an unusual delay, excepting that he has heard that the pieces sent in were mislaid, and for a time not to be found. Not feeling any anxiety to secure the premium, even if this might have been done, (of which of course he cannot feel any assurance,) and sincerely wishing to aid his friends in Albany in the great and good cause in which they are engaged, he has withdrawn the piece from the depository for the sake of publication in the Albany periodicals, at the present time.

The writer is almost afraid to make the statement as above, lest it should be thought to be his intention to cast some blame on those concerned with the proposal or adjudication of the question, which was originally the occasion of his writing. He entirely disclaims any such motive. He fully believes that no one concerned in the business had the remotest intentions of any improper dealing with the pieces sent in. He makes the present statement only to account for the form, manner, and occasion of the piece. MOSES STUART.

Andover, Theol. Sem., May 4, 1835.

What is the duty of the Churches, in regard to the use of fermented (alcoholic) wine, in celebrating the Lord's Supper?

A satisfactory answer to this question is necessarily connected with the present state of the temperance question in general. What positions in respect to this may be regarded as well established, and what still remain in a greater or less degree doubtful, are inquiries that of course precede the discussion of the subject immediately before us.

A brief answer to these inquiries is all that can be expected on this occasion; and in reality such an answer is all that is desirable. So widely diffused at present are the excellent publications in different parts of our country, on the subject of temperance, that there is no reader in any of the walks of life, who may not have access to a knowledge of its leading principles, and few indeed to whom they are not in some degree known.

The points that are universally admitted by reasonable and considerate men, of whatever denomination or party, may be summarily stated as follows:—

1. All *intoxication* is forbidden by the Scriptures, and by the laws of our physical nature. Those who do not admit the authority of the Bible will concede that intoxication is injurious to health, usefulness, estate, morals, and reputation. It follows,

2. That all such use of intoxicating liquors of any kind, as will produce drunkenness, or injure health or usefulness, is unlawful.

Argument on these subjects is no longer necessary for the mass of our community, and surely it is not needed for Christians. Among these, moreover, and among all sober and judicious men in our community, with few exceptions, the following positions may be regarded as fully and finally established; viz.,

That the habitual and common use of ardent spirits, or distilled intoxicating liquors in any form, or the manufacturing and vending of them for common use as a drink, IS AN IMMORALITY.

The United States Temperance Convention, held at Philadelphia, and composed of more than four hundred delegates of highly respectable character and great influence, the state temperance convention held at Worcester in Massachusetts, composed of more than five hundred delegates from all parts of that commonwealth, a similar convention held at Utica in the state of New-York, another at Middletown in Connecticut, also at Columbus in Ohio, and at Jackson in Mississippi —state conventions, moreover, in Vermont, Maine, and New-Jersey; a convention of cities in New-York; several legislative and judicial temperance societies, and particular societies in counties, towns, districts, and parishes, with several thousands of Christian Churches, have all united in the expression of the opinion, that the habitual use of ardent spirits, or the manufacturing and vending of them as a common drink, *is an immorality.* There are still, I acknowledge, some professed Christians who have doubts respecting this; and of course they are not satisfied that the practices in question are an offence against the laws of Christ, which ought to subject a member of a Church to its discipline. The number of these however, is evidently diminishing; and we may believe and trust that the time is not far distant, when there will be an opinion among all professed Christians in our country,

which will accord with the present prevailing sentiment at least as extensively as temperance itself prevails.

Among no class of citizens is the opinion that drinking ardent spirits is injurious more widely diffused or more firmly held, than among *physicians.* To their distinguished honor be it said, that contrary to their pecuniary and worldly interests, they have come forward, and already more than *two thousand* of them have testified that in no case does drinking of ardent spirits promote health; that it increases exposure to disease, and renders the management of this, when existing, much more difficult, and the issue more dangerous.

This testimony being allowed, (and who is competent to contradict it?) it follows, that *the use of ardent spirit as a common drink is a sin against our physical nature.* The unbeliever therefore, who professes to be only the disciple of natural religion, as well as he who admits the authority of revelation, must confess that the general and particular temperance conventions of our land, assembled for the sake of discussing questions pertaining to the subject of temperance, have rightly decided that the using or vending of ardent spirit as a common drink IS AN IMMORALITY.

Such then are the general positions at present, in regard to the subject of temperance, positions which may now be taken as a basis for future argument and action. Accordingly I shall so consider them, in the remainder of this Essay; and consequently I may leave them without farther remark.

But there is one interesting part of this great subject which yet remains in some degree unsettled in the minds of many sober and excellent men. A great part of the temperance conventions and societies have as yet, in their discussions and decisions, left the question respecting *the use of wines* untouched. It is well that they have done so; for it is always best in such great matters as this respecting temperance, first to produce, if possible, union of sentiment and action on points that are of a plainer and more fundamental nature. This being done, and the general subject being better understood by a course of discussion and experiments, points that seemed to be difficult or doubtful at first may finally have such light cast upon them as that a general union of sentiment may be produced respecting them.

Some of the general conventions, however, on the subject of temperance, and many local societies and Churches, have already considered the question as it respects *wines* and every species of intoxicating liquors, and have decided the broad and general principle, that *duty requires abstinence* FROM ALL INTOXICATING LIQUORS *of every kind and name.* The simple basis of their reasoning may be stated in a few words.

'The Scriptures forbid all *intoxication*, in any degree. The laws of our physical and mental nature equally forbid it; because both body and mind are injured by it. No species of liquor which intoxicates can be used habitually, without great danger of forming an excessive attachment to it; for so the universal voice of experience decides.—No person, therefore, can indulge himself in the habitual or frequent use of any liquor which has an inebriating quality, without at the same time incurring the danger of forming a habit which will prove injurious to him, and which may be fatal. Now it cannot be innocent nor consistent for those who are taught to pray, *Lead me not into temptation,*

thus voluntarily to rush into it. It is a settled point—one now past all dispute—that WATER IS THE BEST AND SAFEST OF ALL DRINKS. No other liquor therefore can be *necessary;* some medicinal cases only excepted, which need not be and are not here brought into the account. It follows then, since water is the best of all drinks, and since no intoxicating liquor can be taken either habitually or frequently without danger, that it is contrary to the true spirit of Christianity and to the laws of our physical and intellectual nature, to indulge in the frequent or habitual use of wine, or of any other liquor which can inebriate.'

Thus do the Churches and societies argue, who have proscribed the common use of wine. Most of them advance indeed still farther.—They are willing to make the supposition that wine does no harm as a common drink, in order to present the most favorable side of the argument to those who differ from them in opinion. Allowing now for the sake of argument that it does no harm, they have still another and an important question to ask, viz., *Does it do any good?* Physically or mentally, (a few cases of bodily indisposition excepted, where stimulant is temporarily required,) habitual or often repeated stimulus does no good, except merely to gratify the taste. All well educated and sober physicians are now agreed that habitual or frequent stimulus of any kind must not only do no good, but inevitably do harm in the end. The reason is very plain. He who takes stimulus in health can derive little or no benefit from it in sickness. The gratification of taste then seems to be the only good that is to be accomplished by the common or frequent use of wines. But is this of so high and noble a nature that it should be sought after and indulged in by a Christian at the expense and hazard which must of necessity attend it? And beside, it is quite certain that the drinkers of pure water acquire a higher relish for that element, and have more enjoyment in partaking of it than ever falls to the lot of those who habitually indulge in the drinking of wine. Those who have made a fair experiment of both may be confidently appealed to for a decision on this question.

To the inquiry then, Does the drinking of wine often or habitually do any good? the persons in question suppose we may answer without any hesitation, that it accomplishes *no important* good; that it sacrifices a greater good, even on the score of taste only; and that the danger with which it is *always* attended makes it at the very best a practice of great hazard.

The writer of this, who for a long time after the efforts to bring about the temperance reformation had commenced, did not think it expedient to bring forward the discussion respecting *wines*, is persuaded that the time has now come, in which the question should be fully and fairly discussed. After often and deliberately examining the subject proffered by the question, what is the fundamental inquiry for every true friend of temperance to make, in order to satisfy himself as to the course which duty now bids him to take; he cannot perceive that this inquiry can amount to more or less than what is contained in the question: *Is* INTOXICATION ITSELF, *or only the* METHOD *in which intoxication is produced, the main subject of our concern?*

How can the sober inquirer after simple truth and duty hesitate as to the answer which should be given to this last question? Is it of any serious importance to a man, either as it respects his body or mind,

or of any serious importance to society, whether he intoxicates himself with rum, or brandy, or gin, or wine, or any other spirituous liquor? I admit that some of these liquors are more costly than others, and some of them more immediately and highly deleterious than others. Drunkards upon ale prepare for a speedy ossification of the heart, and must expect a sudden death. Newly distilled whiskey and other liquors of the like nature are more inflammatory than spirits which are matured by age. Immoderate wine drinkers may live perhaps longer than the immoderate drinkers of liquors highly alcoholic. But their estate is sooner wasted. Wretchedness and poverty of course sooner come upon their families. The example which they set, moreover, may in appearance have less of what is odious and horrible in it; but for that very reason it is likely to do the more mischief to others.

Intoxication, and all approach toward it, in all its stages, from whatever liquor it proceeds, is deleterious to body, mind, and outward estate. There may be some differences and some gradations in the mischief done by inebriating liquors; but in a mere question of *duty and conscience* they can scarcely be worth regarding. In cases of a *moral* nature, of religious duty, the question is not simply, in most cases not at all, whether a thing is *more* or *less* evil, but whether it is *evil*, and therefore to be avoided.

Nothing can be more certain, than that intoxication, in all its gradations from the lowest to the highest, *is evil moral and natural.* Can it be lawful then for me to incur this evil by the use of any liquor whatever, so as in any degree to intoxicate myself? Plainly it cannot.

Now if wine be an intoxicating liquor, (as all must know, who know any thing of its nature, or who are aware that most of our fashionable and common wines are nearly one half as strong as brandy,) then why is it not as wrong for me to use wine so as to produce any degree of intoxication, as it is to produce the same effect by any other liquor? Is it possible to make any difference here as to the *principle* which is concerned, that will amount to any thing worthy of serious notice in a *moral* point of view?

The true and fundamental principle then, of all Churches, and of all the real friends of temperance, would seem to be, that *the frequent or habitual use of all liquors which can produce intoxication is to be avoided.* All that comes short of this fails of reaching the essential point to be aimed at. Surely it will be conceded that the grand object of all temperance measures must be to put a stop to intemperance, and not merely to discuss the niceties of difference between one intoxicating liquor and another. Can any thing effectually do this, but to refrain from the frequent, the habitual, or excessive use of all liquors, whatever may be their specific name or nature, which contain sufficient alcohol to produce intoxication, when drank in any quantity that we can well suppose men capable of drinking? If this be not a principle plain, simple, and fundamentally essential to the ultimate objects of all temperance societies which are thorough, I confess myself unable to see what radical and effectual principle can ever be established.

On any other grounds do we not contend with *names*, rather than with *things?* On any other ground what do we, except proscribe certain liquors because they have an odious name; while we admit the use of

others which produce the like or the same effects, because they are called by a name that has not yet become reproachful?

It will doubtless be said in answer to this, that the use of wine is proved by experience in wine countries not to be attended with the same hazard as the use of ardent spirits. It has often been asserted that persons do not as readily become intemperate by the use of wine as of ardent spirit, and that in case they do, its effects are much slower than those of distilled spirits, as to the destruction of health and life.

The first of these assertions, however, is matter of controversy.—Witnesses who have visited wine countries have of late been found to differ in their testimony relative to this subject. All the wine countries in Europe carry on the manufactory of brandy as well as wine; so that the opportunity for becoming intemperate by the use of ardent spirit cannot there be wanting. That there are fewer drunkards, however, in France, Spain, and Italy, than in England and America, seems to be more generally conceded. But whether this is owing to the state of opinion and habit there, in regard to intemperance, or whether it is to be put to the score of wine being less adapted to create a thirst for inebriating liquors than distilled drinks, would seem, from the present state of evidence, to be a more doubtful question than has hitherto been generally supposed.

Dr. Hewit, the former agent of the American Temperance Society, to whom the cause which they advocate is so greatly indebted, visited France a short time since, on purpose to ascertain the real facts in respect to their habits of temperance. I beg leave to quote his own words, as descriptive of the result to which his inquiries led. 'We have heard it affirmed,' says he, 'that France is a wine-drinking, but still a *temperate* country. The latter is entirely false. The common people there are burned up with wine, and look exactly like the cider-brandy drinkers of Connecticut, and the New-England-rum drinkers of Massachusetts. If they do not drink to absolute stupefaction or intoxication, it is because sensuality with Frenchmen is a science and a system. They are too cunning to cut short their pleasures by beastly drunkenness; and therefore they drink to just that pitch at which their judgment and their moral sense are laid asleep, but all their other senses kept wide awake. This is the only satisfactory explanation of the strange inconsistencies of the French character. And this explains how, with all their characteristic volubility, they are ready for any crime which can be committed. Their minds are kept at the point of excitement, where they are ready for any thing of this kind, while, at the same time, they know their own interest too well to drink to absolute stupefaction. Hence the horrors of the first revolution.' (Cited in the tract called the Clinton Family, p. 151.)

Other testimony from highly intelligent and observing men it would be easy to produce, did the limits of this Essay permit; other testimony, I mean, which serves strongly to corroborate this statement.—But I readily admit that different views have often been laid before the public. On the whole, therefore, the judgment of a serious inquirer after the truth, in relation to the actual state of intemperance in the wine countries, must be in suspense, until we have some farther light. Variety of testimony may easily be accounted for, without any impu-

tation of partiality, or even of erroneous judgment. Witnesses who visited different places in the wine countries, have seen different habits prevailing among the people in regard to the matter of intemperance, and have therefore given us different accounts, which seem, at first view, to contradict each other, but which in reality do not.

At all events the advocates for using wine as a common drink have no right, in the present state of the question respecting wine countries, to assume the fact that the people in them are unusually temperate, and to build upon such an assumption. More satisfactory testimony in their favor is needed, before this can safely and fairly be done.

But there are other questions of great interest, in respect to wines, some of which it is indispensable that we should here notice.

Medical men, so far as I know, seem to be satisfied that drunkenness by wine is less deleterious, in some respects, than drunkenness by ardent spirit. It is, as it would seem, the more general opinion among them, that the alcohol in wine is so modified by the other substances with which it is associated, as to be less inflammatory than that which is contained in distilled spirits. Hence the conclusion made by not a few very sensible and well-informed men among them, that there is much less need of opposition to the drinking of wine, than to that of ardent spirit.

That there is some foundation for such an opinion, one can scarcely doubt. That it has been carried much farther, however, than facts will warrant us to carry it, is what I verily believe, and shall now endeavor to show.

One reason why mere ardent spirit mixed with water produces a strong sensation and great excitement in the stomach, is, the imperfect mixture which it undergoes, for the most part, before it is drunk. But let the mixture be completely made, and the difference between water with ardent spirit and wine of the same strength, is scarcely if at all perceptible.

As this is a fact of great importance in the present inquiry, and as it has often and even generally been otherwise represented, I must produce my voucher for such an assertion.

Mr. Brande, of England, one of the most celebrated practical chemists of the present day, has analyzed spirituous liquors and wines to a greater extent, as I apprehend, than any other man now living.—From him comes the analysis to the number of fifty-eight different liquors, which is fully exhibited on the first leaf of the seventh Report of the American Temperance Society. Early in his labors of this nature, so long ago as the year 1812, this distinguished chemist read *an Essay before the Royal Society in London*, an extract from which I now beg leave to make, as having a very important and (as it seems to my mind) decisive bearing upon the point before us.

'It has been frequently asserted,' says he, 'that a mixture of alcohol and water, in the proportions I have stated them to exist in wine, would be much more effectual in producing intoxication, and in the general bad effects of spirituous liquors, than a similar quantity in wine itself. *But this is true to a very limited extent only.* When brandy is added to water, it is some time before the two liquids perfectly combine; and with alcohol this is more remarkably the case; and then the mixtures are warmer to the taste, and more heating, if taken in a state of imperfect union, than where sufficient time has been allowed for

their perfect mutual penetration. I have also ascertained that *distilled* Port wine tastes stronger and is more heating than in its original state; and that those qualities are unimpaired, and the wine reduced nearly to its original flavor by the addition of its acid and extractive matter.'*

'With Claret and some other wines, containing less alcohol and being more acid than Port, these circumstances are more readily perceived. Lastly, *if the residuum afforded by the distillation of one hundred parts of Port wine be added to twenty-two parts of alcohol and seventy-eight of water, in a state of perfect combination*, THE MIXTURE IS PRECISELY ANALOGOUS, IN ITS INTOXICATING EFFECT, TO PORT WINE OF AN EQUAL STRENGTH.'

Allowing the correctness of this statement, which, so far as I know, has not been controverted, it follows, that alcohol and water of equal strength with wine, mixed with the residuum of wine obtained by distilling away all its fluid parts, produces the very same intoxicating effect as the wine itself of equal strength would, before its distillation. It may still be true, and probably is, that the residuum in question produces some modifying effect upon the alcohol and water mixed with it. Any nutritious substance, milk, bread, fruit, any thing which employs the digestive organs, seems in a greater or less degree to modify the action of alcohol. Every one who has had experience, knows that alcoholic drink taken upon an *empty* stomach will produce much more excitement and disturbance of the system, than when taken with a meal, or even with a small quantity of food. So far as the *nutritious* substance of the grape is incorporated with wine, so far it may serve, and doubtless does serve, to modify the alcohol which the wine always contains, when it has been fermented.

But with all the allowances which are to be made on the ground just stated, can there be any *important* MORAL difference between the action of the alcohol in wine upon the human system, and pure alcohol mixed with a quantity of water sufficient to reduce it to the same strength?—Mr. Brande says respecting this very point of difference, that *it is true in a* VERY LIMITED *extent only*. The experience of careful observers will decide, as I must think, in the same way. The writer of this in early life was accustomed, by direction of physicians, to drink alternately a small quantity of wine or brandy every day, on account of the feeble state of his health. He never perceived any sensible difference in the action of the alcohol in the two liquors, when taken in the same quantity as to their respective strength. The difference generally believed in seems to arise principally if not entirely from the fact, that wine is more usually drank *with* or *after meals*, especially full ones.—The entire effect of that which is drunk late in the evening is in general not well observed, inasmuch as sleep soon succeeds the drinking of it.

We may allow, then, that physicians have some foundation for the opinion, that the action of alcohol in wine is modified by its mixture

* Mr. B. evidently means by 'distilled Port wine,' the liquor that is obtained from it by distillation until all the fluid part is drawn off. The qualities that are 'impaired,' by mixing this liquor again with the residuum which is found after distillation, are 'warmth to the taste and a heating quality.' In other words, the wine in its *original* state is less heating than the liquid distilled from it, if this be drank by itself.

with substances that come from the grape, which are of a nutritious and digestible nature, for in the like manner the action of pure alcohol and water may at any time be modified by any species of nutriment.—But now, for the *substance* of the matter—is there any *important* difference between alcohol itself in *wine*, and the same alcohol in *water?* Mr. Brande, an excellent authority on such a question, says there is not; experience, the experience of nice practical observers, as I verily believe, will agree with his decision.

Supposing now this ground to be correct, the *moral* question as to the frequent or habitual use of wine, remains the same for *substance* as the question respecting the use of brandy and water, or alcohol diluted in any way, so as to be of the same strength with wine. And if it be said, as I have already intimated it is, that the effects of drinking wine are less rapid and fatal to health and life, than those of drinking ardent spirit; we may allow that there is some foundation for this remark, (for doubtless there may be,) and yet is there difference enough between the two things to make the one *lawful* and the other *unlawful?* Stimulating the system habitually in any way with alcohol, whether in wine or any other drink, cannot possibly, if we credit the best physicians, be otherwise than injurious to the health of body and mind. It is therefore an offence against the laws of our nature; and consequently against the will of that God who ordained them. One may truly say, by way of illustration, that to put a man unjustly to death by *burning* him alive, is an *aggravated murder;* but to *drown* him without any just cause, although this is putting him to a lenient death, is still a *murder.* Habitual drinking of wine, then, may be less deleterious, and in some respects less criminal than the habitual drinking of ardent spirit; but does it therefore follow that stimulating with wine in such a manner is not really evil in the sight of God?

Let us look at this subject, however, in a little different point of view. For the sake of argument, we will concede that alcohol in wine is considerably modified and softened, in consequence of its combination with various matters that are extracted from the grape and combined with it. Yet, after all, the advocates for moderate wine drinking cannot help admitting that there is active alcohol enough remaining in all wines of which we have any knowledge, to produce intoxication.—Facts place this beyond all possibility of doubt. The modification, then, can be only *partial.* Men may and do become drunk with wine. As to that part of alcoholic action, then, which still remains after all the modification that we can with any degree of probability admit, what are the advocates of temperance to say? The most that can be truly alleged is, that a native wine of fifteen per cent. alcohol, as we may say for the sake of example, becomes, by being mixed with substances derived from the grape, analogous in its effects, in all important respects either physical or moral, to alcohol and water, or brandy and water, of strength a little inferior to the apparent strength of the wine. I see not how we can, in consistency with plain and certain facts, possibly make any thing more or less than this out of the whole matter. The alcohol in wine is still sufficiently strong to make men drunk, place the *modification* of its action at just as high a pitch as you please. Facts then can never be set aside, after all; and while it is a fact, that men intoxicate themselves continually upon wine, and do the same thing

with ardent spirit, all that remains to be said, is, that drunkenness on wine is less pernicious than that upon ardent spirit. But this, again, is what has never yet been *satisfactorily* shown; and I may add, what is not likely to be established. Where men are dyspeptics, (and most hard drinkers become so of course,) the *acid* that is in wine occasions far more grievous and distressing consequences to the health of the wine-bibber, than the intemperate drinking of brandy occasions. We may appeal to the severe head-aches that nearly always follow intoxication by wine, which are far less frequent among those who are addicted to brandy or rum.

Advocates, then, for the moderate drinking of wine, are bound to show us some way in which we can escape from the conclusion that wine drinkers are alcohol drinkers. Admit all the modification they plead for, and when all is done, there is sufficient alcohol left which is active and intoxicating, to render wine objectionable. Can a temperate man consistently indulge himself habitually in the drinking of such alcohol? This is a fair statement of the case, even on their own grounds; and yet the necessary conclusion from it is such as is enough to make the frequent or habitual drinking of wine revolting to every thorough-going advocate of temperance.

But there is still another view of this subject which must now be taken, before we can be prepared to advance to the ultimate object of our present inquiry. I have all along spoken of wines, without any reference to the *actual* state or condition of them as used in our country.

It is a fact well known at present, and too generally conceded to need any proof here, that all the wines of our country, (excepting merely a few casks brought from abroad by the special order of a small number of individuals,) are mixed with brandy or other ardent spirit. No doubt seems now to remain, that by far the greater quantity of what is sold and drunk as wine in the United States, is manufactured in the midst of us, in a great variety of ways, and often by the incorporation of deleterious substances. It is a well known practice, moreover, of all the manufacturers of wine abroad, where it is made from the grape, to add brandy to it, in order to prepare it for exportation.—This is thought to be the only way in which it can be kept from becoming acid; and indeed it is the only successful way which seems yet to have been discovered. Hence no *pure* wine can ever be obtained in this country, by importation from abroad, except by special order and great pains taking to prevent its being brandied. The higher wines have usually from eight to ten per cent. of alcohol added, i. e. one gallon of brandy at least for every five of wine; and the lower ones a like proportion, in respect to their original strength. No native wine has yet been analyzed which yields more than from fourteen to sixteen per cent. of alcohol. Few, if any, fall below ten per cent. of alcohol in their native state, i. e. even the lower wines are in general about one fifth as strong as brandy.

What then is the actual condition in which these wines, yielding in their native state from ten to sixteen per cent. of alcohol, come to be used by us? Almost without exception the wines in more fashionable use contain from eighteen to twenty-five per cent. of alcohol, i. e. they are from *one third* to *one half* as strong as brandy in its usual state and before dilution.

Such is the information communicated to the world by the result of Mr. Brande's experiments. I take great pleasure in adding, that the experiments of a skilful and excellent chemist of our own country, Prof. L. C. Beck of the city of Albany and state of New-York, accord in all important respects with the results in general of Mr. Brande.— By an analysis of nearly all the wines imported to this country, and of our own indigenous alcoholic drinks, Dr. Beck has, during the past year, laid the Christian public and all the friends of temperance under great obligations to him. The result of the whole of his protracted and very numerous experiments, is detailed and spread before the public in the American Temperance Intelligencer, extra, of May, 1834, printed at Albany by the noble temperance-corps there, who merit the thanks and blessings of all the friends of virtue and humanity throughout the world. The small variations from Mr. Brande's results, which appear in some of the results of Prof. Beck, are easily accounted for by the difference there is in the mode of manufacturing wines, every vintner putting in brandy according to his own judgment and taste, as is well known to be the fact. Beside this, different soils give to the same grape greater or less strength.

Of twenty-one wines (but not all of different sorts) analyzed by our countryman, none contained less than eighteen per cent. of alcohol, i. e. they were about *two-fifths* as strong as brandy, at the least, while most of them were nearly *half* as strong. The average strength of *twenty* of these wines was found to be about twenty-two per cent. of alcohol. Only Sauterne, Claret, and native American wine, were found to be comparatively weak; the first of these containing thirteen per cent. of alcohol, the second a little more than eleven, and the third nearly twelve, i. e. these lowest wines were at least *one-fourth* as strong as brandy. Of nearly the same strength is metheglin (10.57 per cent.;) strong beer, 10.67; cider, nearly 5.

One very important result has come from the experiments of Mr. Brande and Prof. Beck. This is, that *the production of alcohol is now fully ascertained to be by* FERMENTATION, *and not by* DISTILLATION. The reasons of such a conclusion are briefly stated by Dr. Beck, and are for substance as follows:—

1. Alcohol is obtained from wines by distillation, *at the temperature of sixty degrees of Fahrenheit;* which of course precludes the idea, that alcohol is formed by the action of *heat* upon the elements existing in the fermented liquor.

2. Alcohol is *lighter* than wine. If it is formed by the process of distillation, and does not actually exist in the wine before it is distilled, then if it be added again to the residuum of wine after being formed by distillation, the same quantity by measure of wine would be lighter than before. But this is not the fact. The wine is of just the same specific gravity as before distillation. Of course the alcohol itself is just the same fluid before distillation as after it. Consequently it is not formed by distillation, but by *fermentation.*

3. Precipitate the coloring and extractive matters of wine by the subacetate of lead, and the pure alcohol may be separated from it without the process of distillation, viz. by the addition of dry subcarbonate of potash; in the same way that it can be obtained from whiskey, gin, brandy, &c.

These experiments settle, then, the very important question, *How is alcohol generated?* No doubt now remains that it comes from saccharine matter contained in fruits, vegetables, &c., and that it is always and exclusively the product of *fermentation*. Before fermentation, any quantity of wine, cider, &c, that can possibly be drunk, will produce no degree of intoxication, because alcohol is not yet formed. And so in respect to different grains and vegetables; any quantity of wheat, rye, barley, potatoes, &c, eaten as food, will produce not the slightest degree of intoxication. But let these substances undergo a process of fermentation, and then the alcohol is generated, and becomes a distinct and separate substance, which is capable of being disengaged from all its concomitant substances by distillation, or by another process as above related.

Alcohol, then,—and be the fact remembered by all the friends of temperance throughout the world—*alcohol is the same substance in wine* BEFORE *distillation as* AFTER *it*. It produces, therefore, as we might naturally expect, in all *important* respects pertaining to health or morals, the same consequences, if drunk often or to any degree of excess. It is not *distillation* which *makes* ardent spirits in any case; it is *fermentation*. The process of distillation gives to alcohol a separate form of existence, by educing it from its concomitant substances.

The reader will observe that I have expressed my views on this subject in a guarded manner. I do not aver that a given quantity of alcohol in wine will produce the same effect in all respects, as it will when drunk in a pure state. I concede the fact, that *some* modification is occasioned by the mixture of nutritive matter extracted from the grape. But wine, after all, does intoxicate to any and every degree; and therefore the alcohol in it, as far as it is not modified, produces the same deleterious effect as the alcohol in brandy or other ardent spirits. All that the modification by nutritive matter effects, is to render it necessary to drink a little more in order to produce an intoxicating effect, than would be requisite if the action of the alcohol were not in some degree modified. But how this can change the nature of the intoxicating effect in any *important* respect, as it regards either morals or health, I am quite unable to perceive. Getting drunk is neither more nor less than getting drunk; and becoming partially intoxicated is neither more nor less than becoming partially intoxicated; whether it be on wine or ardent spirit. It is the same substance, the same cause, viz. alcohol, which in both cases produces the same effect.

In view of such facts, what must we think then of the great, the long continued, the much insisted on distinction between alcohol in distilled spirits, and alcohol as it exists in wine? The substance of alcohol, as experiment shows with certainty, is the very same in wine that it is in brandy, gin, whiskey, or any of the fiery liquors. All that can be fairly said, is, that nutritious substances of the grape, as before observed, help in some small degree to moderate or mollify the action of the alcohol; but, as Mr. Brande has truly remarked, TO A VERY LIMITED EXTENT ONLY. Temperance societies and Churches have done well, no doubt, to wage war against the common use of *distilled* spirits.—They are an enemy with which, in this respect, no truce and no treaty should be made. A war of extermination is the only Christian warfare against such a use. But this war against distilled spirits has been

hitherto carried on, for the most part, in a kind of exclusive way; and in this way only because, as I apprehend, the necessary light was not yet shed on this part of the subject. But now it seems to stand at last in open day, that distilled alcohol differs in no respect from alcohol in fermented liquors,* except that being in a good degree separated from other and extraneous substances when it is distilled, it is much stronger than in a diluted state. After all, however, it is *fermentation* which creates the alcohol itself. *Fermented* liquors, then, conceal this great enemy of human health and peace; nor is he less deadly because he lies concealed in them. Distilled liquors taken with water and sugar, with milk, or with any modifying substance, can in no important respect be now shown to be more deleterious than fermented liquors which contain the same or at most but little more than the same quantity of alcohol.

It is time then for all our Churches, and all the friends of temperance, to look for the future at *things*, and not to be influenced in their measures by *names*. The public now know, or may know, on the subject of alcohol, what a short time ago they did not fully and satisfactorily know; and what a few years since they did not know at all. Our measures, therefore, ought to keep pace with our light. *Fermented alcoholic* liquors should henceforth become the proper subjects of avoidance and prohibition, and not merely *distilled* ones. The enemy should be opposed and routed, whether in the open field or in ambush.

But here we shall of course be met with the allegation that has been often repeated: 'The Bible—the Holy Scriptures—allow, yea enjoin the use of wine. In a multitude of places they speak of it as in use among pious and excellent men of ancient days; and the Giver of every good and perfect gift Himself required that it should be made a part of every daily oblation in the temple; and the Lord of glory Himself has made it one of the elements of that holy supper, by which His sufferings and death are commemorated among all His faithful disciples.'

The truth of the facts now stated I do most fully and readily acknowledge. Whoever will open his Bible at Exod. xxix, 40, and Num.

* This fact is rendered certain from the process upon wine and brandy in order to separate the alcohol from each. The process is or may be the very same; and the results in all respects the same, i. e. pure alcohol is obtained in the same manner. Now if there were any chemical combination of the substance of alcohol in wine, with other substances in it, and a modification were effected in this way, (as many seem to suppose,) then it would require some different agent to disengage the alcohol in wine from what is required to disengage it in brandy, which contains only *distilled* alcohol. But as one and the same agency or the same means disengages the alcohol in both cases, so there can be no more combination of a chemical nature in one case than in the other; and consequently all the reasoning about alcohol in wine, which is built upon assuming the fact that it is alcohol modified by chemical combination, and so as to become as it were another substance, falls to the ground, inasmuch as it has no facts to support it, but is directly contradicted by well known and certain facts. Alcohol is a *unity* wherever it exists, i. e. it is one and the same substance. It may be mixed with many kinds of ingredients, and the action of it modified by them; but it is in itself always one and the same substance. And as this is now rendered *chemically* certain, it is in vain to build any longer upon the old assumption, that it is a substance in wine of a different nature from what it is in brandy and other ardent spirit.

xxviii, 7, will see that wine or strong drink was part of the daily offering to God, which was to be made by the priests. By consulting Mark xiv, 35, moreover, he will perceive that the cup which Jesus gave to His disciples, when He instituted the sacrament, contained *the fruit of the vine*, i. e. wine. That wine was drunk on sacramental occasions by the disciples of Christ at a subsequent period is quite clear also from 1 Cor. xi, 21, where the apostle sharply reproves some of the Corinthian Christians, because they intoxicated themselves at the holy supper.

On one other occasion, moreover, the Hebrews were permitted to use wine and strong drink. In Deut. xiv, 22–26, they are commanded to tithe all their increase or productions, and to eat of this tithe before the Lord, in the place where He shall appoint. But if the place where they live is so distant that they cannot conveniently carry up the tithe itself with them, when they go to present themselves before the Lord, they are directed to sell it, to carry the money with them, and to purchase 'oxen or sheep, or wine, or strong drink, or whatsoever their soul desireth,' and to eat and rejoice before the Lord.

The nature of this permission amounts to the same thing as a permission in our country, in those states where public thanksgiving is kept, to drink wine and such strong drink as the Hebrews used upon that day.

There are two cases more which merit our attention. Jesus at the wedding feast in Cana of Galilee (John ii, 2–11) turned water into wine, for the accommodation of the guests who were present; and Paul directs Timothy to drink a little wine, on account of his frequent infirmities, 1 Tim. v, 23.

These are, I apprehend, all the decided cases of approbation or sanction to the drinking of wine, which the Bible exhibits. The case in which Wisdom invites her guests to a feast, (Prov. ix, 2–5,) and the injunction to give wine or strong drink to him who is ready to perish or is of a heavy heart, (Prov. xxxi, 6;) the case in which it is said that the Lord will make for His people a feast of fat things, and of wines on the lees well refined, (Isa. xxv. 6,) all range themselves under the same principles as the ones already specified. On special occasions of feasting, such as weddings, thanksgivings, and the like, there can be no doubt that the Jews were accustomed to drink wine, nor any doubt that they were permitted to do so; for the Scriptures do not speak of the temperate use of wine, on such occasions, with disapprobation.—But let it be noted, that *they no where command it*, except in cases where the restoration of lost health is concerned. Wine or strong drink (such as the Hebrews used) must be given to those who are of a heavy heart or ready to perish, i. e. to those who are sunk down and dispirited by disease; and Timothy is required by the apostle to take wine on account of his frequent infirmities; while the use of it at feasts is mentioned merely as a circumstance which was usually connected with them, and a thing which was not forbidden. On this ground, we find that Jesus was accused by the Pharisees of being a glutton and a wine-bibber, because He accepted of invitations to attend such meals or feasts as were prepared in special honor of Him. It would seem to be a natural conclusion, that wine was exhibited at those feasts; although there is no proof whatever that the Savior habitually

drank it when He attended them. The accusation that Jesus was a *wine-bibber*, in all probability, (may I not say, with certainty?) had as little foundation as that He was a glutton. Both were made by the malignant Pharisees.

I must not quit the particular part of our subject which is now under consideration, without remarking that the very fact of wine being specifically mentioned in connection with *feasts* among the Hebrews seems to show very plainly that it was not a common or habitual, but a special drink among them. What writer in the English world, in describing a feast, would now think of mentioning that *bread* and *water* were exhibited at the table? These are elements so common, or rather so universal, that the mention of them would be altogether superfluous. And so in the case of the Hebrews; if wine had usually and habitually been placed on their tables, and was considered and treated by them as a common and necessary drink, how shall we account for the specification of it when their feasts are described? Plainly it stands on the same grounds as the meats that are particularly mentioned, which are never common ones, but the *fatted calf*, *fat things*, *stall-fed beasts*, and the like. The very aspect of the Bible, then, in regard to the matter of drinking wine, shows that it was not a common but only a *special* drink, reserved for particular festive occasions, or else for the infirm and diseased. It can never be made out that Jesus, or His apostles, or any pious Christians of the primitive age, drank wine habitually. The most which it is possible to show from the Scriptures, is, that on special and extraordinary occasions they sometimes drank such wine as the grapes of Palestine afforded; a liquor but little more than half as strong as the wines in common use among us. Even this, we shall see in the sequel, was in all probability much diluted.

No where, then, is the use of wine *commanded*, unless in some cases of broken health; and even then we cannot consider it as a duty to drink it, provided we now have (as I doubt not we in fact have) better means of renovating our strength. Nothing can be more certain than that the use of wine for a great part of the dyspeptics at the present day would be exceedingly injurious, on the ground of the *acid* which it contains. That Paul judged rightly of Timothy's case, we need not be disposed to doubt. That his judgment in this case can be drawn in as a precedent for all cases of disease, or even of *stomachic* disease, it would be an egregious error and even folly to assert. The fact, moreover, that Paul felt himself obliged to give an absolute *mandate* to Timothy, in order to induce him to drink wine, shows that the latter had been accustomed rigidly to abstain from it.

Such then is the Scriptural view of wine, in respect to permitting, or not forbidding the use of it. Let us now look at the other side of this question, and see what cautions and prohibitions and threatenings the sacred writers have given and uttered, in order to prevent every gradation of abuse in respect to such a permission. In order to do this, I must request the reader to stop here, and deliberately to examine the texts to which I shall now refer him, and which (for the sake of brevity) I do not here transcribe at length, viz. Rom. xiii, 13; Prov. xxiii, 20, 21, 29–35; Eph. v, 18; Luke xxi, 34; 1 Thess. v, 6, 7; 1 Pet. iv, 3; Prov. xx, 1; Isa. xxviii, 7; Hos. iv, 11; Hab. ii, 5; Isa. xxviii, 1; v, 11–14, 22; Amos vi, 1–6; 1 Cor. v, 11; Deut. xxi, 18–21;

1 Cor. vi, 9, 10; Gal. v, 19–21. These texts contain the most awful warnings against intemperance; and they also exhibit wine as the principal instrument in occasioning intoxication. Especially was *mixed* wine, i. e. wine medicated by some fiery and stimulant substances, employed by intemperate persons for the purpose of becoming inebriated.

The amount of the whole Scriptural representation, then, seems to be, that while the use of wine or strong drink was enjoined in oblations to God, and while on the day of Jewish thanksgiving the Hebrews were permitted to drink it—while the Savior employed it in the institution of the sacramental supper, and sanctioned the use of it at a wedding feast, and possibly at other feasts, and Timothy was enjoined to use it for a medicinal purpose, yet, for the most part, the Bible is filled with warnings against it, and all excessive use of it is plainly prohibited under the highest penalty.

The lawfulness of *occasionally* using such wine or strong drink as they had in Palestine, is then established, as we must concede, on a basis which cannot be shaken so long as the authority of Scripture and the example of Jesus remain. Among intelligent and enlightened Christians there never can be any controversy on this part of the subject, so far as the simple fact is concerned. It is only the modifications and limitations which we are now called to examine.

But the settling of the principle already exhibited does not settle all the questions which may be asked, and which should be answered in a satisfactory way, if indeed they can be. These will bring us at last to the very point stated at the commencement of this Essay as the object of our inquiries; whither, indeed, all that has been said is designed at last to bring us.

The Hebrews, as it appears from the passage in Deut. xiv, 22–26, were permitted not only to use wine but *strong drink* also, on the day of their public thanksgiving at the close of their harvest seasons. We must stop a moment here, to inquire what was the nature of this *strong drink*, which the Scriptures so often mention in connection with wine, and which, as appears from Num. xxviii, 7, might be used as an oblation or drink-offering in the ritual of the tabernacle or temple service.

Jerome, who in the latter part of the fourth century spent twenty years in Palestine in order to prepare himself for translating the Hebrew Scriptures, has left on record a very explicit statement in respect to the Hebrew *shekhar* שכר, which is almost every where translated *strong drink*. He says, in his epistle to Nepotianus, 'In Hebrew, every drink which can intoxicate, is called *shekhar*; whether it is made of grain, or with the juice of apples, or with honey boiled down into a sweet and singular drink, or the fruit of the palm-tree (dates) is pressed into a liquor, and the water that is enriched by it is colored with stewed fruits.' Herodotus, one of the earliest Greek writers, (fl. 484 A. C.) testifies of the Egyptians, that 'they used a wine (οἶνος) made of *barley*;' Hist. ii, 67. Diodorus Siculus, who flourished a little before the Christian era, also testifies concerning the Egyptians, that 'if any region would not produce the vine, they were instructed to prepare a drink from barley, which was *not much inferior* to wine in fragrance and strength;' Lib. i, De Osiride. That the orientals in general were accustomed to make an intoxicating drink from *dates*, is well

known, and indeed is quite certain, from the fact that the Arabic word *sakar* سكر the same as the Hebrew word already quoted above, signifies *date wine* or *strong drink.*

From these express and altogether intelligible testimonies, it is plain that the word rendered *strong drink* throughout the Scriptures does not signify a liquor *more* intoxicating than wine, but *less* so in general. None of the substances with which it was made, afford so much alcoholic matter in their juices as the grape; and with the process of distillation the Hebrews evidently were not acquainted. Hence, when drunkards were desirous of highly stimulating liquors, they put in them peppers and various aromatics, or myrrh, in order to increase their stimulating power. Had they been acquainted with distillation, this would have been unnecessary. Moreover, Diodorus expressly says, as above, that the liquor (οινος) which the Egyptians obtained from barley, was inferior in strength to the wine, as doubtless it must be; and the same is true in respect to the *shekhar* or strong drink made from all the substances which Jerome mentions.

Wine itself and all intoxicating drinks may be included, and perhaps sometimes were included under the general name *shekhar*, שכר, but in nearly every instance in the Hebrew Scriptures wine is mentioned separately from *strong drink.* The original and simple meaning of *wine* and *strong drink*, as used by the sacred writers, is *wine and all other liquors that have an intoxicating quality.* But wine was evidently the strongest, and therefore it is mentioned first.

We can now see why the Hebrews were permitted, on their thanksgiving day, to use *strong drink* as well as wine; and why they were permitted to present this, as well as wine, in the drink-offerings made to the Lord, Num. xxviii, 7. Our translators needed not (as they have done) to render *shekhar strong wine* in this passage; and probably they would not have so done, had they understood the true nature of the liquors which it designates.

No intoxicating drink, then, existed among the Jews, which was as strong as wine; wine itself among them was never brandied, for the art of distillation was unknown; and the only substitute for ardent spirit was stimulating wines made by the infusion of aromatic and other substances of a stimulant nature. The danger then of intoxication was evidently much less among the Hebrews than among us; and much less than it now is in wine countries, where the distillation of brandy is constantly carried on.

From these important facts we may gather a reason why less caution was used in regard to permission to drink wine, than most temperate men now feel it expedient to use, in regard to drinking our wines, or our ardent spirits. But the utmost extent to which we can gather any express permission from the Scriptures to drink even native wine is, as we have seen, that it may be drunk on a day of feasting or thanksgiving, at a wedding, for infirmities of body, and at the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The habitual and common use of it cannot be fairly deduced from any such permissions or customs as these; but rather the contrary.

I admit that drinking wine on all these occasions may be abused.—It was so by the Corinthians, at the very table of the Lord. But all

abuse of it, all drinking so as in any degree to become intoxicated, every one will admit to be most solemnly and strictly forbidden by the Scriptures. Indeed were the drinking of intoxicating liquors limited to the few occasions where the drinking of pure wine, or a liquor less intoxicating, has received the sanction of the Scriptures, there would be little occasion indeed for temperance societies or temperance efforts in the world. Men could hardly form a taste for spirituous liquors from such a use of wines as that under consideration.

But there are other questions still to be discussed. It must be admitted of course, by all who have any knowledge of ancient wines, and of the state of those in common use among us, that the ancient ones were not so strong by from one third to nearly one half as ours. After all this abatement of the comparative strength of ancient wines, the question may still be asked, and one of much interest it is, Did sober and temperate men among the ancients use wine, such wine as they drank which had but from ten to fourteen or fifteen per cent. of alcohol in it, in its simple state, unmixed with water; or did they mingle it with more or less of water, so as to reduce its strength before they drank it?

This question has a highly important bearing on the answer which should be given in respect to the kind of wine that ought to be exhibited and used at the Lord's table. If it can be shown that Jesus and His disciples did in all probability, at the original institution of the Lord's Supper, *drink wine that was mixed with water*, most readily should the friends of temperance avail themselves of their example, and remove a reproach which is not now unfrequently cast upon the present mode of celebrating this ordinance.

What the general custom among all sober men of heathen Greece and Rome was, we have abundant assurance from the testimony of their own writers.

The Athenians had a tradition, as Philochorus cited by Athenæus relates, (Deipnos. ii, 7,) that Amphictyon king of the Athenians was first taught by Bacchus himself, to temper wine by mixing it with water; on which account he dedicated an altar to that god, under the name of *Orthius*, (ορθιος,) *upright*, because from that time men began to return from entertainments *sober* and *upright*, ορθοι. The same king is reported to have enacted a law, that only wine tempered with water should be drunk at entertainments; which law, when it fell into neglect, was revived again under Solon the great lawgiver of the Athenians.

The very name of the goblet among the Greeks, *crater*, (κρατηρ,) implies that it was a vessel where *mixture* was made; for this name is derived from a verb which signifies *to mix* (κεράω.) Accordingly, the poetess Sappho represents Mercury as mingling ambrosia in a *crater* or goblet; and Homer represents wine as *mingled* in a crater for kings to drink; Athenæus, Deipnos. x, 7.

The proportion in which wine was thus mingled with water, varied according to the different taste of guests and the customs of different regions. Thus Athenæus, who in his tenth book has discoursed at large on the subject of mingling wines, and presented quotations from many ancient authors, represents Archippus as saying, in his Amphitryon, 'Who of you has mingled ισον ισῳ?' i. e. who has mixed an equal quantity of water with the same of wine? Hesiod directs to mix *three*

parts of water with *one* of wine. Anasilas, in his Nereus, says, 'I never drink *three* parts water and *one* of wine,' thus alluding to the mixture usually practised, and desiring for himself stronger liquor.— Alexis, in his Nurse, says, 'It is far better to use *one* part of wine and *four* of water;' i. e. better than to use a mixture of equal parts wine and water. Diocles says that *four* parts should be water and *two* wine. The poet Ion says that Palamades prophesied to the Greeks who were going to the siege of Troy, that 'their voyage would be prosperous, if they should drink *three* cups with *one*,' i. e. three parts of water and one of wine; a notable and expressive testimony in favor of temperance. Nichocares states the desirable proportion to be *two* of wine and *five* of water. Amerpsias and Eupolis state the same; as does Hermippus also in his Dii. Anacreon mentions *two* parts of water and *one* of wine, as the desirable mixture; and he calls the drinking of mere wine a *Scythian* practice.

Such is the statement of Athenæus, a writer who was very learned, and lived near the close of the second century; and it is replete with interest. The last hint which he has given us from Anacreon leads me to remark on the meaning of the Greek phrase, *to act like a Scythian*, (ἐπισκυθίσαι.) By this they designated the drinking of undiluted wine, thereby denoting that to do so was *playing the part of a barbarian*. This shows, beyond all question, what the usual practice among sober men must have been in Greece, i. e. that they did not drink wine unless it was mixed with water, and its strength in this manner reduced.

Athenæus moreover states that among the Locrians the drinking of pure wine was a capital crime, unless it was done for a medical purpose. Among the Massilians, women were forbidden to drink wine. Such was the case also at Miletus. Among the Romans, no slave, and no women of the higher ranks, nor any boys or youths of the same rank before they were thirty years of age, were permitted to drink wine.

Beside these facts from Athenæus, we have others of the like nature. Homer states that the dilution of Maronean wine was with twenty measures of water; and Hippocrates directs that not less than twenty-five parts of water be added to one of Thasian wine. The Romans exhibited hot water in the winter, and cold water in the summer, in order to dilute the wines which they drank at their tables.— Juvenal calls the waiter at the table, *calidæ gelidæque minister*, i. e. the waiter for hot and cold water. Lucian, in describing the Greek feasts, says, that 'wine was set on the table, and water made ready, both hot and cold;' in Asino. 7. See Henderson on Wines, p. 98 seq.

Such then was plainly the custom among all sober and temperate Greeks and Romans. To drink undiluted wine was *to play the barbarian*. Athenæus says of the drinking songs of Anacreon, that he *feigned* them, for he lived in a temperate manner himself; Deipnos. x, 7.

Were the Hebrews equally sober and temperate? In other words, Was temperance as popular and practised as much among the worshippers of Jehovah, as among nations who worshipped Bacchus and Venus?

We might almost assume the fact that it was; but still we will not.

One thing is certain, viz. that the Hebrew laws denounce intemperance in terms the most severe and awful. Sober and temperate men, therefore, must have an unusual abhorrence of it. Would they then, at their feasts either sacred or ordinary, *play the Scythian*, i. e. drink undilated wine, and thus incur the danger and shame that result from intoxicating gratification?

I ask not what drunkards did among the Hebrews; for there can be no doubt that they procured, as they almost always do, the strongest liquors they could obtain. But our Lord Jesus Christ and His apostles are not to be associated with intemperate men, in any respect. It is not supposable that they did that which, as even nature taught the Greeks and Romans, was immoral and barbarous, viz. to drink undiluted wine.

I am aware of some difficulties in developing the customs of the Hebrews with respect to wine, because of the language employed by the writers of the Old Testament in relation to this subject. We have often the image presented of strong drink or wine *mingled*, i. e. mixed with drugs of a stimulating and inflammatory nature, and wo is threatened to those who indulge in this practice; Isa. v, 22. But there is a different *mingling* of wine, as I apprehend, spoken of in Prov. ix, 2–5, where eternal Wisdom is represented as having prepared her feast, and *mingled her wine*. That the mingling, in this case, is with water or milk, seems evident from Cant. v, 1, where the spouse says, 'I have drunk my wine with my milk;' and Isa. lv, 1, where every one that thirsteth is invited to 'come and buy wine and milk without money and without price.'

How can it comport now with the laws of rational interpretation, to suppose that eternal Wisdom invites her guests to a banquet, where such wine as only drunkards use has been prepared for them? The Greeks and Romans would cry out against such an interpretation and say, This is representing the wisdom of God as inviting men to *play the Scythian*.

Among sober and temperate people, then, throughout Greece, Rome, and Palestine, we may take it as well established, that wine was drunk only in a *diluted* state, diluted with water hot or cold, or with milk.—Did the Savior and His disciples depart from the usual rules of sobriety and decency, when commemorating, for the first time, the Lord's Supper?

To ask the question seems to be nearly equivalent to answering it. If on common occasions men could not drink unmixed wine without incurring the reputation of being intemperate and of acting like barbarians, would the Savior and His disciples, convened under circumstances of the deepest sorrow and distress, have indulged in unusual and even indecent drinking? The supposition is revolting and even odious. It is utterly incongruous with their character and their circumstances.

Nor can the drinking of undiluted wine on that occasion be at all compared with such a practice at the present day, in order to show that it could not have been indecorous. Ardent spirits have usurped the place among us of undiluted wine among the ancients. What should we think of a Church, then, who should now use pure *brandy*, in celebrating the Lord's Supper? We should be filled with horror and

distress. And as verily so, I must believe, would the primitive disciples have been filled with them, if the proposal had been, in the midst of the deepest sorrow and distress, to indulge in a potation which none but revellers ever indulged in. Some now think pure wine a moderate and temperate beverage, because they always compare it in their minds with undiluted ardent spirits. But the Hebrews could make no such comparison. Undiluted wine, or wine mixed with stimulating drugs, was the most intoxicating liquor of which they had any knowledge; consequently a proposal to drink these unmingled or undiluted, at a religious feast, must have been just as revolting to them, as it would be to us to make use of brandy at the Lord's Supper.

We are approaching near to the final issue of our inquiries, 'Is it the duty of the Churches to make use of fermented [alcoholic] wines in celebrating the Lord's Supper?' One thing we may truly say, in answering this question, which is, that Christ and His disciples have left no direction or *command* to make use of strong alcoholic wines.—As to their example, it certainly cannot go to show the propriety or lawfulness of using artificial and *brandied* wines at the Lord's table; which most Churches are known at present to do. In respect to pure wine, moreover, if it can be had, there is not even a distant probability, as we have already seen, that it was drunk at the table by Jesus and His disciples, without being reduced by water. Why should we depart now from their example? If we must use *wine* at the sacramental table, then let us imitate, as nearly as possible, the original use of it; and this, as we have seen, could not have been wine drunk without any reduction by water; at least no probability of this kind can be made out.

The question has been asked, 'Is it *necessary* to employ wine at all at the table of the Lord?' To which I would answer, It is not *necessary*;* for wine was chosen as the representative of one of the natural aliments of the body, viz. drink; by which is symbolized the necessity of our souls' being nourished by faith in the blood of Jesus. It is a natural emblem, even from its color, of that blood. *Necessary*, however, to symbolic use, it plainly is not. The Lord's Supper might be celebrated without it, in like manner as we dispense with celebrating it in an upper chamber—with lying down—with unleavened bread—and with other things of the like nature. But still I do not think, with some of my Christian brethren, that it is *expedient* to dispense with wine at the table of the Lord. The custom of using it may be so managed, that no reproach, no difficulty, no danger will come to the Church or to religion in consequence of it.

Let me now, before I close, present the whole subject in a plain and summary way, and then appeal to the heart of every disciple of Christ, as to his duty in respect to the matter before us.

* We are inclined to dissent from the professor on this point, as, if it had not been the most proper element for the purpose of commemorating the death of the Savior, He certainly would not have selected it, as water or any other liquid was at hand, and therefore might have been used by our Lord on this solemn occasion, had He considered it equally suitable. We think we might dispense with *water* in *baptism* with as much propriety as we could *wine* in the *sacrament of the Lord's Supper*. But with this exception, the above Essay has our most hearty approbation, and we therefore earnestly commend it to the serious consideration of our readers.—Ed.

All intemperate drinking, all intoxication from the highest to the lowest degree, is sin. All use of any liquor that has an intoxicating quality, so as to produce intoxication in any degree, is therefore a sin; and consequently it is forbidden by the Scriptures and by the laws of our nature. Alcohol, which is the intoxicating quality in all drinks that inebriate, is in no sense and never the product of *distillation*, but always and only of *fermentation*. All fermented liquors, then, that have any intoxicating quality, have in them one and the same intoxicating ingredient, viz. alcohol. Distillation merely separates this from other concomitant substances; it never produces it. Alcohol, then, in wine and brandy is just the same substance. The only difference in its effects is, that in wine it is somewhat concocted and mollified by the nutritious substances of the grape which are mixed with it. But this difference, in a *physical* or *moral* respect, does not seem to be worthy of any very serious notice. Ardent spirit can be mollified by sugar and water, or by milk, or by food in the like manner, and to a purpose quite as effectual.

A consistent Christian and advocate of temperance must declare war against all intemperance in every form. He contends not against *names* merely, but against *things*. To him it matters not whether a man becomes intoxicated on wine, metheglin, or any other drink which produces this effect. The *effect itself* is the great point in question; and this, let the cause be named as it may, is always a sin. What matters it, whether the same enemy (for the same it is) lurks under the garb of pure alcohol, of brandy, wine, or any other liquor? It is always one, and only one, and the same thing, viz. *alcohol*. Intoxication is not the less a sin, because it is brought on by indulgence that is surnamed decent or fashionable.

Beside all this, our wines are from one third to one half stronger than those of ancient times, because of the alcohol that is superadded. Yet in ancient Greece, Rome, and (as we have abundant reason for believing) in Palestine, wine was never drank by sober and temperate persons in an undiluted state. It was *to act like a Scythian, to play the barbarian*, to drink it in such a state.

From all this it would seem to be quite certain that persons of such a character as the holy Savior and His disciples, and on an occasion of such deep distress as that when the Lord's Supper was first instituted, did not use undiluted wine. It follows then, that if the Churches wish to conform to their example, they should use only wine diluted; and diluted to such a degree, when it is *brandied* wine, as to reduce it to the strength in which it was probably drunk at the table of the Lord.

It may perhaps be said, that the Christians at Corinth could not have intoxicated themselves on wine so much reduced; as it is manifest they did, by wine drunk at the table of the Lord; 1 Cor. xi, 21. But who will show us that men who could behave thus shamefully on such an occasion, did not drink their wine undiluted? It is highly probable they did; for intoxication could scarcely be produced in most persons by drinking ancient wine diluted by one half or two thirds of water.

Many individuals and Churches have been quite solicitous, of late, to obtain pure wine from abroad, i. e. wine without any brandy super-

added. I honor and commend the feeling which leads to such a measure. But after all, it is needless, as I view the subject. Wines manufactured at home, and above all, such as have *deleterious* substances in them, are to be shunned with horror, for fear of being poisoned. But wines that have merely the juice of the grape in them, with pure brandy added, are to all intents and purposes the same thing, so far as temperance is concerned, when the strength is reduced by *dilution*, as wines that are native and simple. The alcohol that is made by fermentation and is contained in undiluted wines, is just the same thing, so far as it goes, as the alcohol which is obtained by distillation.—Great pains and expense, then, are bestowed on the importation of pure wines, which, so far as the temperance question is concerned, appear to be needless. Due dilution by water settles all questions about conforming to *primitive* usage.

So far as the simple article of bodily health is concerned, pure wines may, and no doubt are, the best, if they can be obtained before they become acetous, and lose their life and relish. But the accomplishment of this is attended with many difficulties.

Why then, I ask with a deeper interest than ever, why should not our Churches follow what was so evidently the example of our Savior and of the apostles, in celebrating the Lord's Supper? If example is to be the ground of celebrating the rite as to the *mode* of its celebration, we have a plain and palpable one; and this would lead us, of course, to dilute our wines, until they are reduced to the same strength as that in which they were originally drunk at the table of the Lord. How great this reduction by water should be, must depend on the strength of the wine, and on the proportion in which it was originally diluted at the table of Jesus and the disciples. On such a point we need not be over scrupulous. The most favorite mixtures in Greece for drinking, was three parts water to one of wine, or five parts water to two of wine. Half wine and half water was deemed a mixture that savored of intemperance. If either of the other proportions be chosen, we cannot, in all probability, be far from the usage of Christ and His disciples. Brandied wines of course would require still more reduction, in order to bring them near to the original standard.

One evident advantage would follow from the practice now recommended. It would take away all opportunity of persons' becoming in any degree intoxicated at the sacramental table. Dreadful as the thought is, yet the deacons of our Churches well know, that there are not wanting persons who, at the table of the Lord, will drink deep of the consecrated cup which is offered to them. Reduced wine would prevent the partial intoxication in which they thus scandalously indulge.

Another serious benefit would result from the practice above recommended. The friends of intemperance now reproach Christians, because in their most sacred rite they do the very same thing which they condemn in the world, viz. drink undiluted wine. This reproach would be effectually removed, by following the primitive example of celebrating the supper.

Why then should not Christians—all the Churches—approve and adopt this example and practice? If they should, would the rite of the holy supper be deprived of any part of its significancy as a symbol? Surely not. A symbol as significant as the Savior Himself made it,

is significant enough for our purposes. And can the presence of more *alcohol* in the wine drunk at the Lord's table add more of religious Christian significancy to the element that we drink? The very thought of this almost makes one shudder. It is revolting, if not absurd.—Why then should not sacramental wine be drunk *diluted?* The only answer that I can think of, is, 'Because some who approach the Lord's table love wine better when it is not diluted;' which, in my view, is an important reason why it should be diluted.

But if there be any Christian Churches, who are desirous to avoid every possible danger from employing even *diluted* wine at the sacrament, and who still prefer to employ wine, or rather *the fruit of the vine*, as one of the elements of the holy supper, they may employ unfermented wine for this purpose, made from native or foreign grapes. We know from Gen. xl, 11, that the ancient custom among the Egyptians was, to drink the juice of the grape immediately after its being pressed out of the fruit. In this state, no quantity that could be drunk would occasion intoxication. In this state, also, wine could be had, by preserving the fruit of the grape, at all seasons of the year. The *new wine*, so often mentioned in the Scriptures, does not mean this liquor, but wine *newly fermented;* which is then stronger than at any other time, inasmuch as none of the ardent spirit is dissipated. Age dissipates, in some measure, the alcohol contained in wine; because heat, at the temperature of sixty degrees will distil off the ardent spirit that is in it. It requires to be very closely kept, in order to prevent this effect.

The *practicability* of providing such a liquor as above described from grapes, even in climates where the vine does not grow, cannot be denied. The expediency of doing it may be safely left to every Church to judge for itself. The lawfulness of celebrating the sacrament in this manner, cannot scarcely be soberly called in question.

I take my leave of this whole subject, by placing it in the attitude in which Paul himself has placed a subject of the like, if not of the same nature. This holy apostle, the most enlightened Christian probably that has ever lived, when he declared that all distinction of meats was at an end, and that one kind of food was no more unclean than another, at the very same time most solemnly declared, that in case the eating of meat, i. e. of meat that had been offered to idols, should occasion his brother to offend, he would eat none while the world should stand; 1 Cor. viii, 13.

Here then is a great principle of Christian action established. *If any thing is not necessary to our comfort and happiness*, but is only a matter of *gratification to the taste, or one of convenience; and yet this thing is injurious to the moral interests, or wounding to the feelings and consciences of others*, FROM THAT THING WE ARE BOUND RELIGIOUSLY TO ABSTAIN. So Paul has repeatedly and most solemnly decided, in his epistles to the Romans and to the Corinthians.

Nor has Paul merely laid down a general principle here. He has identified the very case with which we are at present more particularly concerned. He says, 'It is good neither to eat flesh, *nor to drink wine*, nor any thing whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak;' Rom. xiv, 21. Doubtless he did not mean, in this case, to prohibit wine at the sacramental table; for drinking it there gave no

offence to Christian brethren whom he had in his eye. It was the drinking it on other or ordinary occasions which he would abandon, and which he would that all others would abandon, when it became cause of offence or of stumbling.

Let all Christians then ask the simple question, Does the common use of wine cause others to stumble? Is that use *necessary*; or, in any important sense, of advantage? All well informed medical men are agreed, that water is the best and most healthful of all drinks.—Stimulus by alcohol, in all cases, is to be avoided by all who would most effectually promote health and avoid intemperance. One most striking and instructive fact fully confirms this; although we might easily appeal to a multitude of facts. The interest which the Greeks took in their public games, nearly all of which consisted of feats of bodily agility and strength, is well known to every person in the least degree conversant with the history of ancient times. A long time was usually spent in preparing for these contests; and the *gymnasts* (as they were called) who intended to enter the lists were trained with the greatest possible care, in respect to every thing which could in any way contribute to increase and confirm their physical powers. But this shrewd and discerning people *did not suffer their gymnasts to drink wine*; and they forbade it on the very ground, that *the highest point of physical power could be more effectually reached without it than with it*. When shall we learn as much, by all the lights of science, as these sons of nature learned without them?

With such facts before us, we may well come to the conclusion, that nothing *obliges* us, then, to drink wine often or habitually. And supposing that we might indulge in it on days of thanksgiving, or at wedding feasts, without sin, are we called to do this? Are we, in any sense, *obliged* to do it? Certainly not; and above all we are not permitted to do this where no duty calls us to do it, and where we know certainly that indulgence of this sort will injure the interests of the temperance cause, and lead the friends of intemperance to point to our example, and defend themselves by such an appeal. This they will do, so long as Christians go on in the way that many of them do go, in respect to the use of wine. The times are now such, the interests now pending are so important, that it is not possible for those who indulge in frequent use of wine to say that they do no injury by it. If it be *lawful*, IT IS NOT EXPEDIENT. The nature of the principle laid down by the apostle, and the great interests of humanity, benevolence, and reform, demand an entire abandonment of this practice.

For one, I feel bound frankly to say to my brethren who maintain the right and the expediency of a common use of wines, that their arguments do not satisfy me. They object to those who proscribe such a use, that their arguments would prove a great deal too much, and therefore that they prove nothing. They say that if alcohol is proscribed in every form, then we must not eat bread-corn nor fruits, nor most of vegetables; for all of them will yield alcohol.

But here they are plainly in an error, as to the conclusion which they deduce from their premises. Bread-corn and fruits will indeed yield alcohol; but they do not contain it. *Fermentation* is necessary in all cases to its production. Before fermentation, alcohol, in the proper sense of this word, no more exists in bread-corn and fruits, than

oak timber exists in an acorn. It is certainly true that an acorn will produce oak timber, if it be suffered to germinate and grow. But can we build houses and ships out of acorns? It is equally true, that grains and fruits will produce alcohol; but they must first be subjected to fermentation. Before this, any imaginable or possible quantity taken into the stomach, will produce no degree of intoxication. Any liquor made from grapes or apples will not produce any degree of intoxication, if drunk in any measure before fermentation. The materials then from which alcohol is made, are no more alcoholic in themselves, than an acorn is oak timber. Consequently all the extravagant conclusions, in this respect, which it is said may be deduced from the principles of those who oppose the common use of wines, are entirely without any basis for their support or any ground to justify them. Of course, all appeal to such argumentation is irrelevant and invalid.

Again it is objected to those views which I have been advocating, that the positions which I have taken are such, that they must necessarily exclude the common use of all liquors that have any degree of alcohol in them; and therefore they not only exclude the use of wines, but of cider, porter, ale, and even small beer. The consequence is, that these positions are taxable with *extravagance.*

But is this really so? Admitting the fact, that the premises which I have labored to establish are such as will afford the inference that all liquors which are in any degree alcoholic are to be avoided, is there any *extravagance* in such a position? We will allow, for the sake of argument, that the Scriptures are not explicit in relation to the question now at issue. Yet it does not follow, that the *spirit* of Scriptural precept would not demand the renunciation of all alcoholic drinks for common use. The Scriptures do not specifically and by name forbid forgery, nor arson, nor contraband trade, nor a multitude of other crimes. And why? Plainly because the state of society which existed when the Scriptures were written, did not and could not give birth to such crimes; consequently they did not come under the cognizance of the sacred writers. But has not the Bible, still, in requiring us to love our neighbor as well as ourselves, to do unto others that which we should in like circumstances wish them to do to us, and to submit to the laws of our country, prohibited all the crimes just named, and all others which are not specifically pointed out in the sacred records? This will be conceded. It does not follow, then, that because the Scriptures have not specifically forbidden the common use of all alcoholic liquors, that the spirit of the Bible does not require us to renounce them. The object of Scriptural prohibition or precept, is to establish the great *principles* of religion and morality, not to enter into a specific detail of particular cases.

I take it to be a sound and well established principle, that God has revealed His will by His *works* as well as by His *word.* That there are laws of our physical nature, which will demand and inflict effectual punishment for an offence against that nature, every one knows to be absolutely certain. One of these laws is, that alcoholic drink, taken in any shape, must disturb the natural and healthful exercise of our physical powers. There is no *nutriment* in alcohol. The human stomach refuses to digest it. It is not in the proper sense of the word appropriated by any part of the system. It penetrates the whole, and

is thrown off, at last, by the secretions and by insensible perspiration. It is therefore in itself, to all intents and purposes, a *poison*. Not an immediate and fatal one, I admit, unless taken in considerable quantities; but still, a gradual and subtle one. Nor is it any objection to this idea, that wine may be and is *medicinal*; for nearly all the poisons are now employed in the like manner. Any of them may, by habit, become so comparatively weakened in their force, that they may, for a long time, be daily taken. And such is the case with wine.—But as wine confessedly has alcohol in it, and as there are other weaker drinks which have alcohol in them, we may with propriety ask, What duty obliges us to swallow alcohol? Is our health and strength promoted by it? In common cases they certainly are not, but rather impaired. Water is of all drinks the most natural, salutary, and healthful. Why renounce it then? What duty, what prospect of real good, induces us to abandon it, and take to alcoholic drinks? To do so is an offence against the original laws of our nature; it is an offence against the best maxims for the preservation of health. Nothing can be more certain, than that if any alcoholic drink whatever be habitually taken, we can expect but little if any advantage from wine or any such beverage in particular cases of sickness.

Has not the Author of our nature, then, very plainly told us, that we should avoid the common use of any alcoholic drinks? For my part, I must say, that it seems to me to be written by the hand of God Himself, upon the very nature which He has given us. To say then that He has not prohibited the common use of such drinks, would be no more correct than to say that He has not forbidden such a use of opium as the Turks make, because no precept in the Bible can be found which recognizes and prohibits the use of opium.

If now, in addition to all this, it be true, as it certainly is, that no advocate for temperance can be thorough and effectual and also avoid the reproach of the intemperate, so long as he indulges in the habitual use of any alcoholic drink; if such indulgence serves, as it surely must, to keep in countenance intemperate wine drinkers or drinkers of ale and other liquors of the like nature: in a word, if common indulgence in any kind of alcoholic liquor injures myself and injures my neighbor, then God has forbidden such a use. That these positions are true, can, as it seems to me, be certainly made out to a candid mind; that the conclusion which is drawn legitimately follows, I am not able to doubt.

But here again it will probably be said that the argument against alcoholic drinks of all kinds, must prove too much, because it will prove that Jesus and His disciples, who drank wine, did partake of drink that was injurious, and which therefore was prohibited, in case the principle that I am defending be allowed.

The reader will observe, however, that my argument has, all along and throughout, been directed against the frequent or common use of alcoholic drinks. To say now, that because such a use must be injurious and therefore should be prohibited, is quite a different position from saying that an *occasional* use of wines and drink less strong is altogether prohibited. A poor man who supports himself and his family by his daily labor, may lawfully indulge in a dinner on thanksgiving day, if he eats temperately, which it would be quite unlawful

for him to indulge in every day in the year. All extremes in these and the like cases are to be avoided. An occasional and perfectly temperate use of liquors slightly alcoholic may be cheerfully and readily conceded, and yet the position, that the common use of them is injurious and therefore forbidden, may be strenuously maintained. There is no inconsistency at all in this. A poor man may lawfully wear a holiday suit of clothes on holidays, which it would be criminal for him to wear while engaged in his daily labor.

It never can be shown that Jesus or His disciples indulged in the habitual use of wine. It never can be rendered probable that they drank wine at all, except in a diluted state; and such wine as they drank, when diluted with three quarters or more of water, (which was as we have seen the probable reduction of it,) could scarcely be said, in any important sense, to be capable of injuring them when only occasionally and temperately drunk.

The gratification of *taste*, then, would seem to be the only thing which can be pleaded in favor of wine as a common drink. But this can never come, among sober and judicious men, to be considered as an object of serious importance. Is it not true that those who drink pure water instead of alcoholic drinks, enjoy their beverage quite as much as wine drinkers do? And then, if the gratifying of taste hurts myself, and endangers the safety of my neighbor, and is uncalled for by any duty whatever, can such gratification be lawful?

To sum up the whole case: the advocates of thorough temperance measures hold it not to be a *malum in se*, i. e. an evil or sin in itself, to drink wine occasionally. They do not come out against the practice on such a ground. They rather take the ground, that, since no duty calls them to the frequent or habitual use of any drink which is alcoholic—since such drinks of every kind, when often taken, injure rather than promote health, and afford occasion of stumbling to others; they are bound on the ground of expediency and out of regard to the public good, to refrain from all habitual or frequent use of any liquor that has alcohol in it. It is indeed only on sacramental occasions that a thorough disciple of temperance, at the present time, will feel disposed to taste of any liquor of this nature. Here, the example of Christ and His disciples would seem to give a sanction to the use of wine, which may justly remove all scruples respecting it. But even here, let the example be as exactly copied as possible. Let us not eat nor drink in such a manner as to bring on ourselves judgment or condemnation. Let us not exhibit such wine at the table of our Lord, as in ancient times would have been exhibited only at the tables of the intemperate or of bacchanalians.

In fine, it is our most serious and full persuasion, that if those who love the cause of temperance, and plead and exert themselves for it, do still continue the frequent or habitual use of any alcoholic drink, however slight the proportion of alcohol may be, then the great ends of the temperance reformation will, after all, be in the sequel defeated. As soon as distilled spirits are expelled from common use, the lower kinds of alcoholic drinks will be greatly increased. Ale and cider and wine will become so abundant that intoxication will be made as cheap by means of them as by ardent spirit; and such drinks being made reputable by the usage of temperate men, will be indulged in to all degrees

of excess by those who indulge in any degree of intoxication. Such is already beginning to be the case, particularly in regard to ale and strong beer. But who does not know that the beer drinkers of England are in all respects as degraded and wretched as the whiskey drinkers of our country?

By all that is benevolent and sacred, then, in the cause of temperance, I would beseech the advocates of it to pause, before they give countenance to the fatal consequences that will follow the upholding and encouraging of any alcoholic drink whatever, as one for frequent or common use. These consequences will not in the end be less deleterious to the interests of the community, in any point of view, than if it were deluged with wine and strong beer and cider: then repentance on the part of sober men, who have given countenance to such drinks, will be too late. The harvest will be past, the summer ended, and we cannot be saved.

Christian, whoever thou art, I counsel thee to look well to this matter, and most seriously to examine it. The great Head of the Church does certainly expect of His disciples, that they will do nothing which promotes the interests of intemperance, or keeps those in countenance who practise this vice. The gratification of *bodily appetite* will not avail thee, in the great day of account, as an excuse for a practice which keeps in countenance and encourages those who drink for the purposes of inebriation. Self-denial is that to which the Gospel calls thee. Its high and holy principles bid thee abstain from the very appearance of evil. If thou refusest obedience, thou must be answerable for the awful consequences.

Churches of the Lord Jesus, who celebrate the memorials of His dying love, follow the example of Him whose death you celebrate.—Come not to His sacred feast, and indulge in that which a sober Greek or Roman, even in a heathen state, would have pronounced to be an indecorous practice, worthy only of a people like the Scythians. Let your wine be *mingled*, like that which eternal Wisdom prepared for her guests. Thus may you eat and drink, discerning the Lord's body aright. Thus may your sacred rights be performed, without leading astray the weak, and without affording gainsayers any opportunity to reproach you. The end to be accomplished by such a reformation is worthy of your high and holy profession, of your fervent prayers, and of your best efforts.

ADDRESS

Delivered at the annual commencement of Dickinson College, July 16, 1835, *by* Robert Emory, *A. M., Professor of Languages.*

The spirit of inquiry, which has prevailed in reference to education, has already elicited such copious information on the subject, that some may be disposed to regard any farther discussion of it as useless. Were the productions of the pen and of speech designed only to *instruct*, there might be some ground for the opinion. Could we content ourselves to treat subjects of vital public importance like the mock discussions of the schools, in which the object is to see how much can

be said upon a question, we might admit that if all has not been said on the subject of education that was possible, at least there has been enough for the formation of our opinions, and the direction of our practice. But who does not know that after the public mind has been fully enlightened upon a topic, there still remains the more difficult, and not less important duty, of moving it to action.

The thrilling appeals which so often emanate from the sacred desk, are called forth not so much by the ignorance, as by the apathy of the people. Week after week we repair to the house of God, and hear from the same lips the same holy principles—principles which have perhaps been familiar to us from childhood;—yet we think not the service tedious or unnecessary, because we are conscious that as yet the appropriate effect upon our life and conduct has not been produced.

It is for the same reason that we think that the subject of education cannot be too often presented for our consideration. Although much light has been thrown upon it, by the zeal and learning of those who have treated it, still their labors have not yet produced those practical results which constituted their only object. Parents still allow their children to be educated upon erroneous systems; public seminaries still send forth pupils unqualified for the duties of private or of public life; youth continue, for the most part, blind to their best interests, and are pressing their way, with indiscreet haste, to stations for which they are utterly incompetent. It is useless to discuss the best modes of teaching, or the best systems of discipline, while we have such abundant and conclusive evidence that, as yet, the very object itself of education is by many but little understood. Let us, then, devote a few moments to this inquiry:—*What is the proper aim of education?* It is an important inquiry. It intimately concerns all the relations of society; the public, in their expenditures for the encouragement of learning; the parent, in selecting the instructer of his child; the teacher, in adopting his course of instruction; the youth, in proposing to himself the proper object of his early efforts, and of his generous hopes; all, all, are interested to be correctly informed upon a point in which error may lead to irreparable—to fatal consequences.

On such a question, I would not presume, before such an audience, to obtrude my own crude conceptions, unsupported, as they must be, by any length of experience. But though I may advance no new sentiments, and though I may defend those which have been heretofore advanced by no new arguments, still, I trust, that I shall secure the more humble, though not less useful end, of presenting to you the matured opinions of the wise and good, in such a light, that, while they cannot fail to meet the approbation of your judgment, they may obtain the active concurrence of your practice.

That education in itself is desirable, I shall not consume your time in attempting to prove. The superiority of intelligent over ignorant man; of him, who, in point of mental culture, has been almost fitted for the society of superior spirits, over him who is removed from the brute only by the possession, not by the exercise, of different faculties, is a subject which no longer admits of discussion. No! the question is not whether education is useful, but what kind of education is most useful. We conceive that in this case, as in every other which affects

the interests of man, the proper criterion of the utility of any object is, its tendency to promote his happiness. What then is the system of education that can best abide this test? Is it that which trains the youthful mind to habits of shrewd calculation, and sagacious planning for the accumulation of wealth? A Crœsus, in the midst of his countless treasures, could not extort from the Athenian sage an acknowledgment of his happiness. Is it that which sows the seeds of restless ambition, and creates an insatiable thirst of power? From 'Macedonia's madman' to the Corsican, the most successful aspirants have been as miserable as their most unfortunate competitors. Is it that which stores the mind with a mass of learning, undigested and unsuited to any practical purpose? The wise man of Israel has assured us, that he that thus increaseth knowledge, but increaseth sorrow. Is it that which exclusively fosters some already predominant faculty, adding the influence of art to that of nature, to stimulate it to an unnatural growth? The fate of genius, in all ages, when unsupported by judgment, has become a proverb of misfortune. No! neither distorted genius, nor barren learning, nor unlimited power, nor boundless wealth, are sources of real happiness, and therefore, neither the cultivation of the first, nor the acquisition of the others, is the proper leading object to be proposed in a course of instruction. What then is? It is *the cultivation, in just and harmonious proportion, of all the powers and faculties of man.* This alone can impart a complete and generous education: that which, to use the language of Milton, 'fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously, all the offices, both private and public, of peace and war.'

Such a definition, it is obvious, must include the cultivation not only of the intellectual, but also of the physical and moral powers. And would that my limits permitted, or that my abilities enabled me to brand, with an appropriate stigma, the criminal neglect with which these have been treated. To depict in living colors the cruel folly of those, who, whether from misguided fondness, or blind devotion to fashion, bring up their children with feeble and sickly frames, to be the prey of lingering disease, or the victims of untimely death: or to denounce, with becoming indignation, the still more fatal thoughtlessness of those, who, while they train the body, and discipline the mind, leave the immortal spirit destitute of that moral culture, without which bodily vigor is pernicious and learning a curse. But I forbear. Leaving these interesting and momentous topics to other and abler hands, I confine myself to the single branch of intellectual education.

Here then we maintain, that however proper it may be in the diversity of human occupations, that a man should not waste his strength by vain attempts to pursue them all, but rather confine himself to whatever one may be best suited to his capacity, still this remark does not apply to that period of life which is devoted to education. Then the great aim should be, not to replenish, but to enlarge the capacity; not to prepare the student for any particular vocation, but to impart to him that mental vigor by which he shall be qualified for any station to which subsequent events may lead.

It is true, that, in such a course, there must be much positive information acquired, and the student will be more or less fitted for particular offices; but still these are not the objects, but only the accompa-

nying results: and so soon as any one of them loses this its appropriate secondary character, and assumes that of a principal, we have at once an education partial in its nature, and distorting in its effects. For, as he only is a perfect model of the human frame, who exhibits every member in symmetrical proportion; as he only is a perfect moralist, who combines in his character every virtue; so, he only is a perfect scholar, who has united in himself, and cultivated to their highest extent, all the attributes of mind.

The advantages for every pursuit in life of such an education, or as near an approximation to it as circumstances will admit, need but be stated to be acknowledged. Why is it that upon the occurrence of those changes which are so frequent in our day, whereby the current of public business without being diminished, is turned into new channels,—why is it that there is such an amount of private suffering? Is it not because the unhappy subjects of it have received a sort of mechanical education, which fitted them for nothing but the routine of the particular business in which they had been engaged? Who is the physician upon whom you would rely in the hour of danger? Is it he who has merely stored his mind with the theories of others, and learned by heart the symptoms and treatment of every disease in the books? or is it he, who, by more profound investigation, and more intense study than such plodding ever required, has attained so intimate a knowledge of the human constitution, that nature seems to have revealed to him, as to her favored priest, the mysteries of life and health? Who is the advocate to whom you would intrust the defence of your dearest rights? Is it he who, though familiar with the forms of every action, and the decisions of every case, is lost when out of the beaten track of precedent? or is it he who has penetrated to the foundations of the law, and, from its profound depths, has brought forth principles whose application is as certain as the basis upon which they rest is unchanging?

But it may be asked, What are the studies best calculated to afford this development and discipline of the faculties? Of the various branches, each has in turn had its advocates, who have urged its claims, if not to exclusive, at least to pre-eminent attention. For one, I am as much opposed to 'catholicons and panaceas' in literature, as in medicine; and I would as soon believe that all the diseases of the body can be healed by a single remedy, as that all the faculties of the mind can be trained by a single study. As then all the kingdoms of nature are made to furnish their contributions for the preservation of health and the protraction of life, so let every department of science lend its aid to the formation and perfection of the mental character.

We are not here then to balance the respective claims of the ancient or of the modern languages, of the natural or of the exact sciences,—to depreciate the one or to extol the other; but, to assert the importance of each in its appropriate place.

When it is considered, however, that of these, the study of the ancient languages has of late been an especial object of attack, it may not be thought improper on this occasion to make a short digression, in order to test its value, by the principles which have been advanced.—Before we do so, however, it becomes us to remove an objection of a different character which has been urged against this study, and which,

if it be established, is of itself sufficient to condemn it:—we mean that which relates to the moral influence of the classics. We do not deny that there is much in the writings of pagan antiquity that is false in principle, and corrupt in morality, and which, if unguardedly imbibed, can hardly fail to vitiate the youthful mind; but if, as should always be the case, judicious selections be made, and if whatever that is offensive even in these be made the subject of appropriate comment, we conceive that the effect, so far from being injurious, will be highly salutary. When does the worship of the only true God appear more rational than when compared with the absurdities of heathen mythology? When do His character and attributes appear more glorious, than when He is contrasted with the contentious and libidinous deities of Greece and Rome? Who can contemplate with such profound admiration, the pure principles and the glorious hopes of Christianity, as the classical scholar? The humblest and most ignorant follower of the Cross, indeed, may look forward with joyful confidence to a blissful existence beyond the grave; but it is for him who has heard a Cicero, when contemplating that future state, exclaim, as if in anxious doubt, 'If I err, it is a pleasing error,'—it is for such a one to appreciate the assertion that 'life and immortality have been brought to light through the Gospel.' All can admire the mild and peaceable spirit inculcated by Christianity; but it is for him who has seen inscribed on the schools of ancient philosophy, and has heard from the lips of its greatest masters, that 'revenge for an injury is as great a virtue as gratitude for a favor,'—it is for him to feel, with full force, that the religion which teaches us to love our enemies is not the cunningly devised scheme of a carpenter's son, nor the invention of ignorant fishermen, but that, like its Author, it emanated from the bosom of God.

Supposing then the objection to the moral tendency of classical learning to be removed, we come to what at present more immediately concerns us,—the consideration of the propriety of substituting for it other studies, which, as is alleged, are more interesting in their character, and of greater practical utility.

That this study is in itself uninteresting, we cannot admit; that the modes of pursuing it may be so, we cannot deny. But when it is entered upon with due preparation, and prosecuted with proper guides, it is a path strewed with flowers, and which becomes more and more pleasing at each succeeding step; and if occasionally obstacles present themselves to the student, they do but afford him a faint representation of the course of his subsequent life, for which he will be ill qualified if he has not previously undergone that mental discipline by which he is taught to grapple with difficulties, and even to delight in the encounter.

But it is urged again that this is not a study of practical utility.—The answer to this objection will depend upon the meaning attached to that expression. If by 'studies of practical utility' be meant those only which have an immediate bearing upon a man's business in life, we ask, What branches of liberal learning can be considered as answering that description? Why should the mass of the community be acquainted with the history of other days, or the manners and customs of other nations? What need have they of mathematics beyond the elementary rules of arithmetic? Why should they explore the external

world to discover its constitution and laws, or turn their observation inward, upon the more mysterious operations of their own minds?—What matters it to them to know whether the canopy above is filled with immense suns, the sources of light and heat to other systems, or is merely lighted up by innumerable tapers? Whether the meteors which occasionally flash through our atmosphere with a momentary splendor, are the fragments of some shattered planet, or the 'snuffings of the candles of heaven?' The starry host will perform their accustomed round, the fruitful showers will continue to descend, and the earth to bring forth her increase, the generations of men will come and go,—all the operations of nature will take place with their wonted regularity, alike whether man be informed or uninformed of their laws. It is true that such knowledge may render them much more subservient to our purposes; but if this be the only object, it needs but a few to accomplish it. The engineer can lay out our rail-roads and canals; the mechanician can invent and construct our machines; the astronomer can calculate our almanacs and nautical tables; the chemist can explore the elements of nature, and combine them for the use of the artist. So that, for all the purposes of practical utility, in this low and contracted view of it, learning need never have emerged from the retirement of the study. But if by 'studies of practical utility' be meant those which tend to make happier men and better citizens, which add to private enjoyment, to personal influence and respectability, then we say let all the treasures of literature and science be brought within the reach of all; let history and geography be studied, to enlarge and liberalize their views; mathematics, to teach the art of demonstrative reasoning; the physical sciences to develop the philosophy of experiment and induction; the ancient languages, to cultivate the taste, to exercise the judgment, to strengthen the memory, and to furnish an unfailing source of elegant and rational enjoyment. They all, as before remarked, have their appropriate offices and advantages. The very fact that some of them are better adapted to particular individuals than others, sufficiently proves that they call into exercise different faculties, and that therefore the course of instruction which does not combine them all, cannot impart a complete education.

Nor should the number and variety of these studies be made an objection to their all receiving a share of attention. The cultivation of one does not interfere with that of another. I appeal to the experience of every teacher, whether the diminution of the number of a pupil's studies, provided they have been adapted to his years and capacity, promotes, in any degree, his proficiency in the remainder; or whether it be not true, that a diminution of exercise is often followed by a diminution of strength. The best linguist in a class may not always be the best mathematician; but he is not the worse mathematician for being a good linguist: on the contrary, the union of the two studies is much more likely to promote success in each. For as the strengthening of any one member of the body imparts a vigor to the whole system, so the exercise of the mind upon one subject does but qualify it for more efficient application to another.

As the knowledge of any one branch is not increased, so neither is the time of acquiring it diminished by the omission of other branches. It does not follow, because a certain number of studies can be compre-

hended in a given number of years, that, therefore, any one of them will take a proportionally less time. During the period that is devoted to education, the youthful mind is in a course of gradual development, to which the different studies, and the different stages of each study, must be accommodated; and until the faculties have attained a corresponding growth, it is as incompetent to grasp the higher portions of any one study, as of all. The truth of this remark may be illustrated by the analogy of nature, in her operations in the material world. A productive soil may, at the same time, bring forth a variety of fruits; but by no diminution of the number, and by no improvement in the system of culture, can any one of them be ripened to its just maturity, until the appropriate season has rolled around.

If then it be true, that a close attention to all the branches of a liberal education is the best means of securing high attainments in each, or at any rate, what is more important, of promoting the vigor and energy of the mind, why should any of them be neglected by those who have an opportunity to prosecute them? Surely not to indulge the indolence of the student, nor to gratify the whims of mere theorists in education.

But it may be objected by some shrewd calculators, that, if the youth be not destined for professional life, such a full course of study, or, indeed, the thorough prosecution of any portion of it, will prolong the period of pupilage beyond the time at which he would be fitted for business. It cannot be denied that in the present prosperous state of our country, most young men could obtain a support prior to the age usually allotted to the termination of a college course. But let it be recollected that the race is not to him that starts first, but to him that comes to it invigorated and disciplined by previous training;—that though the well educated youth may be delayed in his entry into business, yet he will eventually commence it with a larger and more available capital.

But did there exist any such pecuniary disadvantages in this delay as are represented, still the moral benefit would more than counterbalance them. When a young man is sent into the world with just enough of learning to make him flippant and conceited, with judgment immature, and principles unformed, it cannot be expected that he should be prepared to resist those temptations with which places of business are always beset. It is this, accordingly, which has filled the gaming table, and thronged the theatre,—which has brought disgrace upon many a son, and anguish upon many a family. When a ship is launched upon the deep, the prudent mariner is careful to provide whatever may contribute to her safety; but our youth are sent forth upon the voyage of life, with swelling sails, it may be, but often without ballast, or compass, or helm, amid rocks and whirlpools more dangerous that Scylla and Charybdis, to encounter storms more terrible than ever opposed the wanderer of Ithaca. What wonder, then, that so many of them meet with shipwreck and death.

But it is useless to attack all the Protean forms which the objections to a liberal education have assumed. We conceive that they have all been answered, if the position has been established, that the grand business of intellectual education is to train the faculties of the mind, and that this training is best effected by a union of all the branches

of literature and science, which are adapted to the comprehension of youth.

If this view of the subject be correct, then female education has been sadly misunderstood. What though, in woman, the brightest endowments of genius, and the greatest acquisitions of learning must, for the most part, shine unseen; yet, does the companion and partner of man, the mother and nurse of the future hopes of the state, the Church, and the world, need no expansion and discipline of mind? Away then with the mean and contracted notion, that the merest rudiments of education will answer for a female; that she needs no geography but that of her own house, no arithmetic but that of domestic expenses, no art but the culinary, no science but that of economy. The sentiment that female ignorance is the mother of domestic bliss, originated with that kindred sentiment, that ignorance is the mother of devotion, and should with it have long ago been consigned to its primitive darkness. Let it no longer be countenanced in this enlightened age, but let us afford to woman an education that shall enable her to claim with justice, and to maintain with dignity, that station in society, which is now too often held by the slender tenure of courtesy.

If the view which we have taken of education be correct, then let parents not select for their children an occupation in life, perhaps before they can lisp its name, and educate them with exclusive reference to this. Until their faculties are developed, it cannot be known for what station they may be qualified. He whose genius you would cramp by some inferior employment, may be destined to enlighten the world.—Give him, then, the best education within your power; and though he should fulfil no such high expectations—though upon the termination of his course of instruction, he should close his books of science and literature for ever—nay, though it were possible that every vestige of positive information which he had derived from them, could be obliterated from his memory, still his time and his labor will not have been spent for nought. Where are the products of your own childish sports and boyish exercises? They have vanished with the hour that gave them birth; but the graceful form, the manly vigor, and the robust health, which they imparted, still remain as substantial proofs of their utility.

If the view which we have taken of education be correct, then, young gentlemen, neither is it for you, at this early period, to be forming projects for your subsequent career, and in consequence to neglect whatever, in your opinion, will not further them; for be assured, that as you know not what may be your future course, so, whatever it may be, no portion of knowledge which you may acquire will ever be found useless. Nor must you suppose that such an education can be obtained by a bare attendance within the walls of a seminary, however judicious may be the course of instruction, or however competent the preceptors. It has been well said by an eminent writer, that 'there is nothing more absurd than the common notion of instruction, as if science were to be poured into the mind like water into a cistern, that passively waits to receive all that comes. The growth of knowledge rather resembles that of fruit; however external causes may in some degree co-operate, it is the internal vigor and virtue of the tree that must ripen the juices to their just maturity.' Your parents, therefore,

may afford you every facility with the most lavish kindness; your teachers may labor in your instruction with the most unwearied assiduity, but all will be of little avail, unless there be superadded the hearty co-operation of your own vigorous exertions. In this sense you must all be self-educated. Go on, then, as I am happy to know that many of you have already begun, go on, and imitate the example of the diminutive but instructive model of industry; the bitterest herb, as well as the most fragrant flower, will alike yield honey to your toil.—Go on, and in the mock combats of the gymnasium, prepare yourselves for the din, the dust, the keen encounter of that war of real life, in which the excellence of the weapons, and the skill of the combatants, must decide the victory.

AN ADDRESS

Delivered to the Peithologian Society of the Wesleyan University, August 25, 1835, *by the Hon.* E. Jackson, *Jun'r.*

Wesleyan University, August 27, 1835.

To the Hon. E. Jackson, Jun'r.,

Sir,—As a committee of the Peithologian Society, and as individuals, permit us to tender you our most hearty thanks for the oration delivered by you on the 25th instant, before the society to which we are attached.

By a unanimous vote we are ordered to request a copy of that address for publication, which we trust you will grant, as we know that an intelligent public cannot but be incited by its able advocacy of polite literature and practical education, to extend more zealous support to all institutions which have these as a part of their object. And we would urge the publication of it from the farther motive, that we feel that its tendency will be to counteract that degrading doctrine, so rife in the world, teaching that all learning is a burden and extravagance, which does not bring with it an immediate or prospective increase of wealth.

We take pleasure in informing you, sir, that Dr. Bangs, the editor of the Methodist Quarterly Review, requests that the address make its appearance in the next number of that periodical.

With sentiments of the highest respect, we are, sir, your most obedient servants,

John W. Burruss,
T. Bangs Thorp,
Moses L. Scudder,
} *Committee.*

(*Mr. Jackson's Reply.*)

August 28, 1835.

Gentlemen,—Though the address of which you request a copy is very unworthy of publication, it is at your service to dispose of as you may think proper. Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

E. Jackson, Jun'r.

To Messrs. *John W. Burruss,*
T. Bangs Thorp,
Moses L. Scudder,
} Committee.

ADDRESS.

Gentlemen of the Peithologian Society,—In undertaking the task to which your flattering invitation has called me, I have been influenced by no vain expectation of fulfilling it to your satisfaction, or my own. Profoundly sensible of the difficulty of preparing a discourse equal to such an occasion, or of worthily treating the great interests of literature and science, my object in acceding to your wishes has been solely to testify a respect for your institution, and a desire to evade the performance of no duty devolving upon me as a member of your society.

With unfeigned pleasure I congratulate you at this your first public celebration upon the success that has thus far attended your persevering exertions to establish a society, which, having in view the laudable design of mutual improvement, deserves the encouragement and good wishes of every friend of education. In spite of unusual and disheartening obstacles, you have from a small band grown to respectability in numbers, have accumulated a valuable library, the fruit of individual liberality, and have laid the foundations of an association, which, if maintained with equal zeal by those who shall come after you, will secure to your names a lasting and grateful remembrance.

Such societies have existed so long in most of our American colleges, as to have fully tested their utility, and not unfrequently have been deemed worthy to enlist the ablest pens and most eloquent tongues, to do honor to their anniversary commemorations. Their aim being more immediately directed to improvement in the arts of composition and elocution, whether they be viewed as an innocent relaxation from the more dry pursuits of science, or as a stimulating excitement of the varied faculties of the mind, they cannot but be deemed important auxiliaries in the plan of education. It is not clear, indeed, that this field for exercising and invigorating the intellectual powers, and training youth in mimic combats for the busy strife which awaits them beyond the academic walls, has ever yet been improved to the extent of which it is susceptible. Though the scheme of collegiate instruction has been greatly enlarged and advanced in our country, the order and classification of study improved, and the diligence of the student rewarded with far more ample stores of learning than our colleges could formerly bestow, it may not be an unprofitable inquiry for those upon whom devolve the honorable responsibilities of instruction, whether the value of societies like yours has received a corresponding attention.

Among their obvious advantages may be enumerated the active exercise of the invention, memory, and imagination. By this intellectual collision the mind is expanded, the recollection of scientific and historical facts refreshed, and new illustrations and perceptions are awakened. Errors are corrected, definite ideas of things fixed, self-complacency checked, and intellectual torpor prevented. A generous emulation quickens the attention, bending it to close investigation and methodical arrangement; without which the mind cannot arrive at conclusions satisfactory to itself, or convincing to others. Precision

of language, fluency of expression, and graceful elocution imperceptibly follow, until at length the deep fountains of eloquence are unsealed, and powers are revealed to the surprised and delighted youth of which he was before unconscious.

A lofty ambition, such as burns in the bosom of a gifted few, may not need the incentives of emulation to arouse its ardor in quest of knowledge; but the mass of mankind require competition, and hence every system of education which has ever been devised, professes to found itself upon this honorable principle. The effect of well regulated debating societies, is to call into action upon a wider scale whatever has been gained by solitary application, and to excite efforts far beyond those which are prompted by the desire of excellence in the daily round of study. In the latter case, that desire is limited to the just comprehension of portions of science, but in the field of debate every science may be made to contribute its aid, and to furnish weapons whose combined and dexterous use tasks the utmost energies of the mind.

The estimation in which such exercises are held will vary with the different views which each one may entertain on the subject of education. He who contemns the charms of felicitous style, or the graces of oratory, though he may not appreciate their importance in these departments, yet nevertheless will not withhold his approbation of their influence in forming and strengthening the reasoning powers. Such diversities of opinion upon the proper objects and direction of education necessarily arise from the different temperaments and habits of men; and in this age of free discussion have given birth to an endless variety of systems for the instruction of youth. The comparative advantages of public and private tuition, the value of ancient classical learning, the establishment of a uniform and equal standard of education,—these, with many other topics of a similar nature, have been agitated in every portion of the civilized world, with a zeal correspondent to their interest and importance.

In our own country, the structure of civil society differing essentially from all historical experience, and presenting new moral and intellectual aspects for philosophical examination, these inquiries respecting the system of education best adapted to a rational and self-governed people, have been pushed farther, and I had almost said more extravagantly, than in any other part of the world. The novelty of our social condition giving plausibility to speculations which cannot always be contradicted by analogy, or confuted by experience, has opened a wide field to visionaries and enthusiasts for the display of their favorite theories, and it is not less remarkable than creditable to the good sense of the people, that thus far these innovators have not been able to make any serious inroad upon the reverend usages and discipline of our universities.

Nevertheless the predominant spirit of the times is improvement.—Already its advances have changed the character of the whole civilized world by such rapid triumphs of art, that nothing less than the most extraordinary discoveries and inventions can arrest the public attention. Every element has been vexed by this active and insatiable principle, its hidden virtues explored, and in innumerable forms made tributary to the service of man. Nor has this eager curiosity been confined to the material world. The human mind has been profoundly analyzed,

its various faculties discriminated and defined, and its operations assisted by the most lucid order and arrangement. The first effect of these close and liberal investigations has been to establish a sound and just philosophy in contradistinction to the arbitrary dogmas which had for ages been received upon the authority of distinguished names; the next effect has been a general amelioration of the social state throughout the world. No sooner had the mind been permitted to discover the true relations of things, than men became impatient of every unjust restraint of their natural or civil rights, and after many and painful struggles, have in some countries wholly, and in others partially reclaimed their original inheritance. In the more favored portions of the human family, the principles of civil liberty, guaranteed by law, have become so completely incorporated with every notion of government, that no change or revolution can ever wholly eradicate them. Instead therefore of that restless anxiety which characterizes nations seeking to acquire their primary rights, a people secure of their possession are intent only upon turning them to the utmost possible advantage for themselves, and for mankind. Hence in our own happy country, no plan of moral or intellectual improvement, no scheme of benevolence or philanthropy, no experiment to mitigate the ills of life or advance the interests of society, is viewed with indifference. The foundation of free schools and other institutions for education, the organization of societies for the diffusion of the Gospel, the establishment of foreign missions, and last though not least, the vast and noble design of African colonization, all bear honorable testimony to the active influence of free institutions. The surprising changes wrought by the light of science in the condition of society are illustrated by nothing more strikingly, than by the increased facilities of intercourse, which not only strengthen every where the bonds of human sympathy, but create a chain along which the spark of knowledge is conducted with electric rapidity. Those are now living who may remember when the literary communication between nations was confined to a few learned men, who contrived with difficulty to maintain with each other an uncertain and irregular correspondence; but now every novelty in science, every production of genius, from whatsoever quarter of the globe, is speeded over pathless oceans by the unrivalled skill of modern navigation in an incredibly short space of time, or borne with still greater celerity into the heart of every country by the swift-winged power of steam.

Amid these various and active improvements the subject of education could not fail deeply to engage and divide the public mind. Much that was deemed venerable by our fathers has been exploded by common consent, as inapplicable to our altered condition, and the question still remains undecided, whether yet more shall not be sacrificed upon the altar of reform. Upon the just determination of this question the welfare of future generations greatly depends, for it may not be denied that education exerts a decisive influence upon national as well as individual character, and that we cannot be too cautious in fixing the standard which may affect the destinies of our beloved country to the remotest time.

While a few still cherish an exclusive veneration for the ancient schools, others are willing to concede much to the vast acquisitions of

experimental science in modern times, while a third party with equal zeal reject whatever is not stamped with an obvious, and as it were tangible utility. As usual, the truth probably lies in the middle course, which, embracing a due portion of the practical science of the age, combines also sufficient of polite learning to save us from degenerating into mere utilitarians.

That a lively concern for the cause of education, and a wise discretion in the choice of means, are not only important, but absolutely essential to the permanence of free institutions of government, is obvious to the slightest reflection; since the only sure tenure of popular rights is their thorough comprehension. Nations subject to despotic rule have but a brief lesson to learn, that of passive obedience; but where the governed are also the governors, no one can become too familiar with the various and complicated interest of political and social economy. The apparent simplicity of our own institutions betrays when closely examined the most consummate art, and whoever presumptuously imagines that such a scheme of civil government as binds together this vast confederacy may be easily devised or successfully imitated,

'Sudet multum, frustraque laboret
Ausus idem.'———

Who shall assert then that any degree of moral or intellectual culture is superfluous to a people daily called, under the auspices of such a constitution, to the exercise of the highest political privileges, and the decision of the gravest questions of human polity?

Yet there are those, I regret to say even among our own countrymen, who refuse to admit the importance of the higher grades of literary institutions, and regard them with a jealous and unfriendly eye, as the nurseries of principles dangerous to freedom, as well as the seats of an unprofitable learning. A prejudice of this kind must be the offspring of ignorance, rashness, or depraved moral taste. Rarely indeed has it the sanction of those to whose opinions experience gives authority, who having themselves drank deeply at the wells of science are best capable of judging of its effects. When we consider that every new acquisition of knowledge brings man one step nearer to the Supreme Intelligence, can it be worthy of a civilized age to wage war like the fanatic Saracen upon the asylums of learning, to bring the human mind down to a dead level, to crush the aspirations of genius, or circumscribe the pure light of science?

It is a vulgar error which confounds the character of cloistered learning with the liberal spirit of modern institutions. Science in those days was the handmaid of oppression, forging chains for the mind when the body was already enslaved. Education was literally a craft, in which the truths of nature and the discoveries of art were blended with a vain and frivolous philosophy, deeply tinged with superstition, and basely dedicated to the service of arbitrary power. The darkness of popular ignorance favored every species of imposture, and gave to its false lights a meteor brilliancy which dazzled and led astray even the strongest minds. The sublime sciences were prostituted to the juggles of astrology and divination; the study of physics was made subservient to the idle pursuit of alchemy; reason moved mechanically, according to the rules of arbitrary logic, and theology was distorted by fables as monstrous as those of heathen mythology. From this delu-

sive and pernicious system the world was at length awakened, by the simplest yet greatest of human inventions, and lifted upon the mighty wings of the press, science soared aloft free and unfettered over the whole civilized world. The unworthy tenants of academic shades were displaced by the ministers of truth, and with the mummeries of religious bigotry for ever fled the sophistries of pedantry, the ostentation of learning, and the creeds of political slavery.

It is likewise a very common and pardonable error of self-taught and strong-minded men, who have hewn out, as it were, their own education without the aid of scholastic discipline, to indulge an overweening contempt for that portion of polite learning which to the classical student is an object of fond veneration. Such persons, referring every thing to the test of its direct applicability to the business pursuits of life, cannot easily be made to comprehend how the study of a dead language, or the perusal of ancient classics, can at all compare in importance with a knowledge of the principles of the steam engine, or the mysteries of trade. They make no allowances because they do not always realize the fine moral influence which these studies exert upon the character, and which have procured for them in some of the schools the honorable and exclusive title of humanities. As intimately connected with individual and social prosperity, the practical sciences are of the first importance, but if man be designed for something more than to make provision for his immediate necessities, or the gratification of his senses, then whatever tends to refine the taste, purify the heart, and exalt the imagination, deserves also a prominent place in the scheme of education. A people whose knowledge should be confined to demonstration, or to mere facts, would be in danger of becoming not only skeptics in religion, but dull and unenterprising in character. The mind requires variety of food for its healthy action, and if we could destroy the records and the writings of antiquity, we should discover, when too late, that we had lost one of the greatest spurs to human intellect, as well as one of the chief sources of its decoration.

Whether it be the necessary result of a general system, or a proof of the peculiar influence of classical literature, it is nevertheless true, that of the multitude of names distinguished in modern history, for that wisdom and eloquence that sway and guide the affairs of nations, or survive in imperishable records to posterity, the far greater number have been deeply imbued with a knowledge of the ancient classics.—Scarce a single exception can be found among the best European writers whose style does not bear the plainest evidence of the models of antiquity, upon which they were formed. Nor does this justify the charge of a tame and servile imitation, any more than the close study of the remains of the great masters of painting or sculpture argues the absence or the restraint of original genius. Whether we imitate the excellencies of others, or aim at originality, still nature is the great prototype, and our success must always be in proportion to the closeness of our adherence to her unerring standard.

The task of public instruction is so responsible and laborious, so replete with sacrifices and privations; its aims are so noble and philanthropic, and the character of its ministers for the most part so exemplary, that we might well wonder how they should become objects of jealousy

or hostility, could we forget that this is the common fate of the benefactors of mankind. If Socrates could not escape the charge of corrupting the youth of Athens, nor the acknowledged truth of Aristides save him from banishment, it were vain for those who imitate their example to indulge too great a confidence in a better fortune. The infidel regards them with dislike as one of the bulwarks of Christianity: to the loose and unprincipled there is a daily beauty in moral restraints and steady discipline which makes their own lives hideous. The idle and ignorant always look with envy upon superior illumination, while many without a motive, and without reflection, hastily condemn that which they have taken no pains to understand. But while the education of American youth continues to be directed by men of such blameless lives and active benevolence as those who have ever graced our seats of learning, there is every reason to believe that they will experience a protecting and fostering care at the hands of a just and intelligent people.

If we proposed to illustrate the value of such a course of liberal studies as our universities alone afford by reference to any particular science, no one perhaps would exemplify it more forcibly, than that which of all others stands first in our estimation, because it is the source and the safeguard of our dearest rights,—I mean the science of law. Notwithstanding the simplicity of our theory of government, its practical operation is complicated by social and political relations even more diversified than those which spring from monarchical institutions. The commercial and international code which regulates our trade and foreign intercourse is co-extensive with that of other states, while our domestic legislation superadds the necessity of a perpetual vigilance to conform it to the constitutional standard. The peculiar importance therefore, to us, of a science whose 'seat,' it has been finely said, 'is the bosom of God, and its voice the harmony of the world,' is universally confessed; and we may the more readily, alas! appreciate its value at this time, when the recent death of one of its brightest ornaments is deplored, not merely as the loss of a wise and virtuous citizen, but in connection with his official station, as a great national calamity. A certain forensic dexterity, and practical familiarity with existing laws may be acquired by sagacious and vigorous minds without the aid of liberal education; but no jurist has ever left a durable name in the annals of his own or of other countries, whose labors have not had their foundation in a previous course of academical learning.

'Sciences,' says a great authority, 'are of a sociable disposition, and flourish but in the neighborhood of each other; nor is there any branch of learning but may be helped and improved by assistances drawn from other arts. If therefore the student in our laws hath formed both his sentiments and style by perusal and imitation of the purest classical writers, among whom the historians and orators will best deserve his regard; if he can reason with precision, and separate argument from fallacy by the clear simple rules of pure unsophisticated logic; if he can fix his attention and steadily pursue truth through any the most intricate deductions, by the use of mathematical demonstrations; if he has enlarged his conceptions of nature and art by view of the several branches of genuine experimental philosophy; if he has impressed on his mind the sound maxims of the law of nature, the best and most

authentic foundation of human laws; if lastly he has contemplated those maxims reduced to a practical system in the laws of imperial Rome;—if he has done this, or any part of it, a student thus qualified may enter upon the study of the law with incredible advantage and reputation.'

Such has been the testimony of the wise and learned in favor of academical instruction in the arts and sciences necessary to the successful pursuit of either of the liberal professions. It is in these schools that the most eminent expounders and vindicators of our constitution and laws have already been trained, and from this source, whatever sciolists may assert to the contrary, will continue to be drawn through all time the ablest champions of our political rights. It is no argument against this position, that so few among the numbers who receive collegiate honors, attain to great distinction, for though all cannot be conspicuous, all may be useful in their day and generation, and diffuse even in a limited sphere the influence of sound and enlightened principles. Where public opinion regulates the acts of a government, it is of the last importance that that opinion should be correct, and it is no disparagement of the acknowledged intelligence of the American people to suppose that questions will frequently require their decision, demanding more time, experience, and study, than can be conveniently spared from private engagements. It is upon such occasions that education makes itself felt, and no society is so small as not to contain some at least, whose disciplined habits of thought greatly assist the just and speedy formation of public sentiment. In this class of individuals the great proportion will be found to consist of those who have enjoyed the advantages of academic instruction, and furnishes strong testimony of the practical benefits which it confers upon society.

So far also from being dangerous in their political tendency, the learned institutions of modern times are the favorite haunts of liberty, where the sacred fires will longest burn, because they are fed by the hands of virtue and religion. Every appeal wrung from suffering humanity, every cry of freedom that breaks the stillness of European despotism, is echoed back from the bosom of her universities. But though the flame of liberty glows no where more brightly than in the breast of the solitary student, it is not among the votaries of learning that are found those factious demagogues and turbulent politicians who disturb the peace and endanger the safety of nations. Absorbed in more tranquil and innocent pursuits, they have little thirst for popular applause, or leisure to brood over schemes of ambition. If they turn their thoughts sometimes to public affairs it is with minds enlarged, elevated, and warmed by the recollection of those bright memorials of ancient virtue which their studies have made familiar. To meditate aught against the true interests of their compatriots would be in them a double crime, involving treason against their country, with a sacrilegious contempt for the inspirations of classic story. The divine lessons of Homer, the glowing patriotism of Demosthenes, the stern virtue of Tacitus, and the indignant muse of Juvenal, restrain with salutary awe the heart that has once acknowledged their power. Who that has ever enjoyed the story of Ulysses tried by every vicissitude of fortune, yet ever sustained by reliance upon Heaven, has not been taught an exalted lesson of piety. Who can contemplate the portraits

drawn by the masterly hand of Plutarch without being enamoured of truth, and inspired with love of country? Seldom can we rise unmoved from the spectacle of human wo, or the triumphs of human virtue, however plainly depicted; but how much more vivid and durable is the impression, when genius invests the tale with its most captivating graces, or transmits it in harmonious numbers to the latest posterity!

An objection to the mode of education we have been considering has had its origin in a real or affected doubt of the practicability or expediency of attaining a high literary character in a republic constituted like ours. The argument of its inexpediency is calculated to provoke a smile, when contrasted with the morbid impatience invariably excited in us by reflections upon our national literature. The most cynical railer at classical learning at home indignantly repels the assaults of foreigners upon the merits of our writers, and holds it to be a duty to assert for his country the loftiest pretensions in arts as well as arms. While such an honorable pride inflames the bosoms of Americans, a pride of country which abroad merges domestic discontents, and even party feuds, in the broad sentiment of patriotism, there is little room to apprehend the want of incentives to fame, or indifference to the cause of letters.

This alleged incompatibility of our civil institutions with excellence in the liberal arts and sciences, is deduced among other reasons from the absence of the patronage of privileged orders, or of the support of royal munificence. But if these causes have sometimes contributed to the encouragement of learning, they have as frequently hastened its decline, by substituting for the vigorous fruits of unfettered intellect the sickly growth of flattery and courtly dependence. History teaches us that the love of *fame* has been in all ages the most powerful incentive to literary renown, and that however the beams of patronage and power may warm into life the fine arts, of which wealth is the indispensable aliment, yet the human mind displays its masculine energies no where so conspicuously as in republican communities. Simplicity, the attribute of greatness, does not belong to a highly polished and artificial condition of society, but on the contrary, the most majestic efforts of genius have illustrated ages of comparative rudeness. The master poet of antiquity recited his verses for a precarious subsistence to a people little removed from barbarism, and the sublimest bard of modern times flourished under the auspices of a Puritan republic.—The influence of hereditary institutions may multiply the number of the highly educated, but how few of that favored class profit from their superior advantages, beyond the increase of their own susceptibilities to the refinements of taste, or ever turn their attainments to the honor and improvement of society. Even that nation from whom we are proud to derive our origin, owes to the republican features of its constitution the *most* brilliant names which adorn its annals, men who sprang from the humbler walks of life, graced with no titles but those of genius and virtue, and unaided but by the strong impulse of necessity and ambition. From such examples we may learn that intellectual power does not depend upon any particular forms of civil society so much as upon the freedom of its operations, and that like the mountain pine it can strike its roots deeply in the roughest soil, and thrive in the most inhospitable atmosphere.

The rise and progress of philosophy, understood in its largest sense, has been slow and laborious wherever it has flourished. The infancy of nations is sufficiently occupied with the first wants of nature, in providing for security, and in the establishment of order and good government. With the attainment of these ends comes that leisure for the prosecution of studies which is not to be found amid the din of arms and the busy pursuits of commerce. There is therefore nothing discouraging in the fact that a people scarce fifty years old, still actively engaged in laying the foundations of a mighty empire, should have added little to the stock of human learning, in comparison with more ancient nations. The wonder is, that they shou'd have done so much, and presages what they may do when the enterprise of its citizens shall seek new channels of distinction and compete with the old world in literature, as they have already successfully done in practical science. We need not be ashamed to acknowledge that our chief motive to intellectual exertion has thus far been necessity, since wherever the path of knowledge has held out the prospect of reward, we have been enabled to demonstrate that it is not impossible to keep pace with our trans-Atlantic brethren. The same genius which has enabled commerce to overcome the current of the mightiest rivers, and to explore the most remote and perilous navigation, which is rapidly uniting the widely distant parts of this continent by roads and canals, surpassing in many respects those of ancient Rome,—which, in a word, has raised us from the condition of feeble colonies to the first rank of civilized nations, will prove in due time equally capable of disputing with others the palm of excellence in every department of literature.

Nor are there wanting to Americans objects of as lofty pride and generous ambition as ever fired the breasts of any people of ancient or modern days. Placed on a new and vast theatre, where, for the first time since the creation of the world, man enjoys every right which reason and nature approve, elevated by the recollections of a history, glorious, though brief, and conscious of the immense importance to the whole human race of the social experiment in which they are engaged; have any motives more dignified, have any impulses more exciting cooperated on human ambition?

We cannot indeed point to long lines of noble ancestry—our pride is not soothed by the display of heraldric honors—no magnificent remains of art attest our ancient power and wealth, and it is but within a few years that even our name has been recorded as a nation in the pages of history. But into those years what events have been crowded!—Handfuls of men, the germ of future states, present themselves first to the view, at wide intervals along our extensive coast; their settlements scarce visible upon the margin of primeval forests. From these points we behold them spreading in small but resolute bands over unexplored regions, looking to Heaven and their own brave hearts for defence against wild and hostile tribes. Through what scenes of suffering, of violence, and blood were they doomed to pass, before establishing their infant communities in security and peace! Scarcely had this been accomplished, when new and more portentous dangers threatened to frustrate all their labors, and deprive them of their dear-bought freedom. For seven years a powerful and haughty foe, who had carried her conquests to the ends of the earth, poured upon this

devoted nation an unceasing storm of war. Amid plundered commerce and conflagrated towns, amid the destruction of youth and age by the edge of the sword, or the toils and diseases of the camp, no thought of submission, no propitiation of the wrath of an offended monarch, could be extorted from this high-minded people. While we are enjoying the peaceful fruits of that memorable struggle, it is wise sometimes to look back upon its scenes, that we may neither forget the debt of gratitude we owe, nor the value of privileges purchased at so dear a price.

Every part of our common country furnishes a page of local history full of adventurous enterprise and extraordinary changes. Two centuries ago, the valley through which flows the noble river on which we reside, was one unbroken wilderness. At this day probably a million of inhabitants dwell there in peace and prosperity, strangers to suffering and want, and experiencing every advantage which equal and beneficent laws and widely diffused education can confer upon man.—Contrast this picture with that of any other nation of ancient or modern times, with the system of conquest and colonization of the Greeks and Romans, or the gigantic schemes of the first civilized monarch of Russia, and which of them presents the more noble and animating picture of national glory, or reflects the highest credit upon the race of man! What American would exchange the sentiments of honest pride with which he surveys the peaceful triumphs of civilization in his native land, for all the blood-stained trophies of the Roman legions, or the thousand victories of France or England? That which enhances the value of these considerations is the fact that this pacific progress is not the offspring of a timid or unwarlike character, but the necessary result of a scheme of government founded in reason and true philanthropy. The tendency of our institutions leads us to estimate nations not by the terror of their arms, or the extent of their possessions, so much as by the number of benefactors they have contributed to the human family. Take from the pages of history the names of those who have taught mankind how to live and how to die, and what remains but a dark disgusting picture of human vices. Amid the weary waste of ambition and of crime, these appear like the verdant spots and gushing fountains of the desert. When the artificial distinctions of society are forgotten, when national antipathies sleep with the promiscuous multitude in the grave, the examples of such men become the common property of mankind, and survive in a wider sphere of usefulness and fame.

But while we contemplate with pride the rising glories of our destined career, let us not forget the warnings of experience, nor that it has been the lot of nations invariably to decline after reaching the meridian of prosperity. How far our institutions may contain that conservative principle which has hitherto been sought in vain, and how long they may ward off the dangers of revolution and dissension, Omniscience can alone perceive; but this at least we know, that if we cannot escape the common doom of nations, our fall can only be protracted by *the cultivation of virtue and the dissemination of knowledge.* The spirit of civil convulsion is always fierce, savage, and destructive in proportion to the ignorance of the people. The unchastened instincts and undisciplined passions of men are easily roused and excited to break through the restraints of law; but an educated people are slow

to embark in revolutions—they weigh the grounds of discontent, estimate coolly the prospect of relief, and ultimately rally to the side of reason and justice. However weak and credulous minds may be moved by artful misrepresentations to repine at imaginary discontents, the great body of the American people, so long as they continue to be an educated people, must see and feel what no other nation has ever before realized, that no change can improve their condition, and that therefore every one is concerned to maintain the cause of law and order.

These exhortations to speed the march of reason and improvement address themselves with peculiar force to such of our youth as enjoy the privileges of collegiate instruction. Upon the soundness of *their* views, and *their* fidelity to the cause of learning the literary reputation of our country almost wholly depends. If they imbibe just notions of moral and intellectual philosophy ; if they carry into society a taste for the elegancies of literature and the arts ; if they inculcate by example a zealous esteem for the institutions of learning, their combined influence will operate with powerful and salutary energy upon the public mind. Before such a concentrated light the mists of ignorance and the delusions of prejudice will melt away, and our country will find in her ingenious and accomplished sons more safety than did Thebes from the armed hosts that issued from her hundred gates.

To realize these auspicious results is no slight achievement ; to qualify himself to guide and direct the taste of others, the student must by patient labor first purify his own. The course of study in our universities, if diligently prosecuted, is sufficient to give to the judgment sound direction through life. But whatever aids experience may supply to smooth and facilitate the rugged paths of study, they avail little, unless seconded by the closest application, and the most persevering attention. The imagination, spreading its flight over the intermediate gradations of labor and diligence, is too prone to revel in the anticipation of that goal which can only be reached by slow and arduous steps. This impatience so natural to youth is often augmented by that stern necessity which prematurely forces the American student upon the theatre of active life, and requires therefore the greater vigilance to restrain it within the bounds of reason. The effects of hasty and superficial culture are the more serious, because they are irreparable, especially when accompanied with the self-complacency which cannot discover its own deficiencies. Happy, thrice happy is he who sees in the preliminary stages of education, only an introduction to the highest enjoyments which this world affords, who rejoices each day in the acquisition as it were of new senses, and new capacities ; who feels his moral and intellectual power dilate, his dignity and value in the scale of created beings augment, and can reflect with proud satisfaction that these are the trophies of his own exertions.

To you, gentlemen, and to your fellow students the path of science is opened under circumstances which are equally a subject of felicitation to this community, as to yourselves. Filling the place of an ephemeral institution which exemplified one of those popular, but delusive innovations upon the established system of education, to which allusion has been made, the Wesleyan University is destined to imitate its predecessor neither in its premature prosperity, nor its swift decline.

Without any ostentatious claims to superiority, it is silently but steadily winning its way into public confidence, fixing its foundations for future usefulness slowly, but durably, and exhibiting in its annual public examinations the fruits of excellent discipline, and a thorough system of instruction. Every department of science taught in other colleges is filled by able professors, who to the ordinary sense of responsibility superadd the ambition of giving an honorable name to their infant university. To these gentlemen it is but rendering a just tribute of praise, to remark with commendation the tone of manly sobriety which characterizes the manners of their pupils, and commands the respect and confidence of society.

The religious denomination under whose immediate auspices this institution has been founded, having ever been remarkable for energy and perseverance, not less than for their fervent piety, it is not unreasonable to expect that the same zeal which has planted the cross in the remotest confines of civilization, softened and subdued the wild and fierce manners of the farthest west, and illustrated every where, by the most shining examples, the Divine precepts of the Gospel, will not fail to distinguish itself by equal efforts in the cause of learning. Their simple habits and sound practical sense peculiarly adapt them to the purposes of republican education ; and with the support of its numerous friends, and its own meritorious titles to public patronage, the day cannot be distant when the Wesleyan University must take rank with the first institutions of our country.

These hasty reflections, gentlemen, which require so much of your indulgence, cannot be more appropriately concluded than by invoking for our now happy and beloved country the continuance of that Divine favor which has ever signally attended us ; which having saved us from foreign oppression, can alone by the inspiration of wisdom and virtue save us from self-destruction. So far as human means can influence human fortunes, ours are emphatically in our own hands. With every variety of climate, soil, and production, remote from external enemies, and enjoying the protecting smiles of Heaven, what but our own folly can prevent the fulfilment of the highest destinies for which man has ever yet been reserved ! While we cultivate in our domestic policy a spirit of justice, moderation, and wise forbearance, may no hostile foes disturb the repose of our eagle as he surveys the boundless scene of grandeur that bursts upon his view ; may he long behold the star-spangled banner waving in peace from the frozen regions of the north to the glowing climes of the south, and prepare to wing his exulting flight from the rising to the setting sun.

AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY.

Nineteenth Annual Report of the American Bible Society.

We gladly avail ourselves of the privilege of submitting to our readers a condensed view of the doings of this society, during the nineteenth year of its existence. At a time when every secret spring is set in action—every motive which prompts to individual and social effort—every argument which can be addressed to the understandings

or passions of the people, are resorted to for the purpose of keeping up an excited action in the public mind, it is no less cheering than profitable to behold the charitable institutions of our country silently 'pursuing the even tenor of their way,' shedding on all who come within the circle of their influence rays of light and heat, and conducting them onward in the paths of 'peace and pleasantness.'

Though the political horizon be overspread with portentous clouds which seem to threaten us with a destructive storm—though there are 'shakings and tremblings' in different parts of our republic, particularly in some of our large cities,—we trust the God of the Bible will overrule these things for our good, and that those dense clouds, instead of pouring down the hail-stones of destruction, will yet 'distil as the dew upon the tender herb, and as the rain upon the grass.'

Antagonist principles are indeed, as they always have been, at work. Each is emulous to obtain the preponderance. Which shall eventually prevail is known only to the God of Providence. We have reason however to believe, from numerous declarations of the spirit of prophecy, that 'righteousness shall yet cover the earth'—that idolatry shall be crumbled to the dust—that superstition shall be banished from among men—and that the 'arm of Jehovah shall be made bare in the sight of all nations,' and that

> 'Jesus shall reign where'er the sun
> Does his successive journeys run.'

Among other causes now in operation which are likely to contribute to the consummation of this grand prophetic period, the general circulation of the Holy Scriptures 'without note or comment,' is not the least. This is 'the sword of the Spirit.' And wherever the Spirit Himself is present to use His own sword, it shall do execution. The *living* ministry must be present to wield this Divine sword, with hearts filled with the 'unction of the holy One,' and then both together shall 'pull down the strong holds of Satan.' We are glad to find in the introduction of the report before us, such a distinct and marked recognization of the Divine hand as is expressed in the following words:—

'"In all thy ways acknowledge Him, and He shall direct thy paths." This inspired counsel, so proper for individual observance, is no less worthy of regard by those who act in an associated capacity. The conductors of the American Bible Society perform a most obvious as well as cheerful duty, when they acknowledge a Divine hand in the origin of this institution, and ascribe to the same source all the success which has attended its subsequent operations. They and their predecessors have acted under the abiding impression, that "except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." It was the kind providence of God which brought together Christians of different religious names, and united them in this happy confederacy, and which has since preserved unbroken harmony among the managers, and among their fellow laborers throughout the land. The same overruling

Providence has raised up liberal contributors, prepared the way for the extensive circulation of the Scriptures at home, and opened for their reception many entire nations, which were wholly inaccessible to the Bible distributor when the Society was formed. In all this the managers would distinctly recognize the agency of Him who inspired the sacred volume, and designed that it should be diffused among every people and tongue. They would at this time specially acknowledge the kind providence which has been over the Society during the year now closed, and which has permitted them to meet so many of their respected brethren and fellow laborers on this anniversary occasion.'

The following is the amount of the *receipts* during the year :—

'In the course of the year there has been received into the treasury from all sources, the sum of $100,806 26, being an increase of $12,-205 44 over the receipts of the preceding year.

Of these receipts there have been—

In payment for Bibles and Testaments, - -	$34,918 23
From legacies, - - - - - - - -	3,877 26
For distribution in foreign countries, - - -	31,821 02
Unrestricted donations, - - - - -	27,973 78

Bibles and Testaments printed.

There have been printed in the course of the year,

Bibles, - - - - - - - - -	16,000
Testaments, - - - - - - - -	8,000
Spanish Gospels, - - - - - - -	10,000

Who has not felt for oppressed Greece? Her moanings have come up before God, and we hope it may be said in truth that 'the set time has come to visit her' in mercy. The Turkish yoke has been broken; and though her 'young men have been slain in the streets,' and her maidens exposed to the rapacious destroyer of their innocence—and though a 'foreigner rules over them,' because of the oppression of the many—yet we trust God has mercy in store for her children. Both the civil and Christian world have turned their attention to this interesting portion of our race; and who knows but the efforts which are put forth in their behalf may be crowned with success? British and American missionaries have visited their shores, and are now assiduously employed in watering their soil with the water of life; and the American Bible Society is lending its aid to scatter among them the 'bread which shall endure unto everlasting life.' The following is the account given of this laudable work :—

Modern Greek Testament.

'It was stated in the last report, that 1,305 copies of this book had been forwarded to the Rev. Messrs. King, Temple, Robertson, Brewer, and others, in Greece and vicinity. From all these gentlemen named, letters have been received, though neither of them had as yet given the work a thorough investigation. As the translation, however, is familiar to readers in the Testaments formerly distributed in that country by the British and Foreign Bible Society, and as your plates were read by competent modern Greek scholars, little doubt can

be entertained that the book will prove a blessing to many ready to perish. From a very recent letter from the Rev. Mr. Brewer, at Smyrna, the following extract will show how the work was received in that quarter:—

'"Agreeably to your intimations, I have received two boxes of Greek Testaments, which I found to contain, the one 231, the other 200 copies—in all 431. A few dozens of these remain not disposed of, only because we are uncertain when our stock or Mr. Baker's depot will be replenished. With very few exceptions, these have been gratuitously distributed in the schools of Smyrna and its vicinity. In determining the proportions, I have acted chiefly in conjunction with the Rev. Mr. Jetter, of the British Church Missionary Society, who, as well as myself, has been especially devoted to the department of schools. Fifty copies were sent to the school in the neighboring village of Cookhijah, on the suggestion of Mr. King, and a few others have been given on the recommendation of Mr. Temple, with the offer of dividing the whole stock with him if he chose. Twenty copies have been sent to the schools in Magresia, forty to the schools of Mr. Jetter in the neighboring schools of Boujah. His and our schools in town, and six or seven others of the public schools have shared the remainder, in different proportions, from ten to seventy; and I can assure the friends of the Bible cause that it has been most refreshing within a few days past, on attending their annual examinations, to see the rows of these red-edged volumes intermingled with the brown and black borders of Testaments and Psalters, heretofore liberally presented by the agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society."'

The total number of copies of the Holy Scriptures issued the last year, including the entire Bible and parts of it, is 123,236, and the aggregate number since the formation of the Society in 1816, is 1,767,736.

'The blind shall see.' Among other improvements of the age—while the deaf and dumb are taught to read and write, and to converse, an experiment has been made to enable the blind to read. The report gives the following facts:—

New Testament for the Blind.

'A short time before your last anniversary a donation of nearly two hundred dollars was received, contributed at a public meeting in Boston, to aid in preparing the Scriptures for the blind. During the year now closed, the attention of your board has again been called to this subject by Samuel G. Howe, M. D., principal of the "New-England Society for the Education of the Blind." After having spent some time in England, France, and Germany, pursuing investigations connected with the humane object to which he is devoted, Dr. Howe has commenced the preparation of books with raised letters, which his pupils easily trace and comprehend by the touch. Numerous experiments have been made, and great pains taken to reduce the letter to the smallest palpable form, as only one side of a sheet can receive raised letters. Having determined as to the size and form of letters, having obtained a press suitable for this species of printing, this gentleman, on behalf of the institution with which he is connected, and of

more than six thousand blind in the United States, has applied to your board for means to publish the New Testament. After satisfactory inquiries, the managers have granted one thousand dollars towards the accomplishment of this interesting object, and have promised farther assistance during the coming year. The entire expense of this Testament will be about six dollars, and the contemplated edition of five hundred copies, three thousand dollars. To aid this publication, the Massachusetts Bible Society has contributed one thousand dollars, and the New-York Female Bible Society, with a characteristic liberality, has ventured to promise the sum of eight hundred dollars. It is ascertained, that after a season of practice, a blind pupil will read this raised letter with much facility. How great and unanticipated must be the blessing which this publication will bring to multitudes, shut out from the beauties of the material creation, and doomed to so many hours of mental solitude. In the appendix will be found a communication of Dr. Howe, which will give additional information on the topic presented above.'

It is a lamentable fact that wherever the Roman Catholic religion has obtained the predominancy, there the Holy Scriptures are denied the people in their vernacular language. Protestantism, in its renovating operations, enlightens the mind, by banishing the darkness of popery, and awakens a spirit of inquiry among all ranks and orders of the people. Though we cannot subscribe to the maxim that the 'Bible *is* the *religion* of Protestants,' yet we know that wheresoever the Bible is *read*, *understood*, and its truths *felt*, by being applied to the heart through the energies of the Holy Spirit, there the religion which it prescribes as the remedy for the evils of our nature is *enjoyed*, its blessings duly *appreciated*, and all its holy fruits are seen growing and thriving to maturity. Though therefore the Bible is not religion itself, yet it describes what religion is, how and where it may be found, and what must be done to disseminate it among mankind. Let then this bright lamp shine in all its Divine lustre—let its truths be understood and felt—its holy precepts experienced and practised, and the destructive errors of popery shall disappear—civil and ecclesiastical despotism shall be prostrated—and the genuine principles of civil and religious liberty shall prevail and triumph.

Who does not therefore rejoice at every successful effort to send the Bible into Roman Catholic countries? South America, so long cursed with the blighting influence of Romanism—so long torn to pieces with civil discord, as if the just retributions of Divine Providence were now visiting this land where the detested Cortes and his sanguinary associates inflicted such summary vengeance upon the defenceless natives—South America is receiving the word of life by the instrumentality of the American Bible Society. The following extract from the report will show what is doing in this benevolent enterprise in this interesting portion of our continent:—

'From Mr. Isaac Watts Wheelwright, the society's agent for Spanish America, several communications have been received in the course of the year. He reached the republic of Chili in March, 1834, with about 2,000 copies of Bibles and Testaments, mostly in the Spanish tongue. In the course of seven months he visited Santiago, the capital, Valparaiso, Conception, Aconacgua, Quillota, Coquimbo, and many other of the larger towns, carrying with him a supply of books for each place. The civil officers, the common people generally, and a part of the priesthood were highly favorable to his benevolent object. One clergyman, a member of the senate, expressed his full conviction that the Bible ought to have an unrestricted circulation. The bishop of the diveen, however, summoning the agent before him, expressed his disapprobation of his labors, and requested him to desist from farther distributions. The consequence was, that two boxes of books which had been left with a native agent for disposal, were received back to save them from the flames. In the south part of the nation less opposition was manifested, and a good number of books disposed of, many of them for the use of schools. The total distribution in that republic amounted to about twelve hundred copies.

'The agent next visited Lima, the capital of Peru. Here he found less of direct opposition to his work. Indeed some of the clergy and others manifested a willingness to organize a Bible Society for the purpose of circulating the Scriptures, a measure, however, which your agent did not, on the whole, think it wise to adopt. A lamentable apathy toward the Bible is found to prevail by the agent in all places which he visits, even where no opposition to him is found. Few place such a value on this blessed book as to be willing to purchase it, unless at a price greatly reduced, and many will not purchase on any terms. In the course of a two months' residence in Peru about 400 copies have been disposed of, a part of which went to interior villages. Your board have forwarded to the agent an additional number of Bibles and Testaments, and also copies of the Gospel of Matthew. There is reason to expect that for the latter there will be found a more extensive demand. As the agent appears to your board to be judicious, economical, and persevering, as he has now the language of the country, and as the need of Bible influence is painfully obvious among the people where he labors, it seems desirable that his services should be prolonged another year, at least until a full experiment is made, whether the word of life is there to have free course or not. Your board cannot but indulge the hope that the more discerning of those countries will, ere long, see that the stability of their civil institutions, as well as the growth of true religion, is never to be realized by them, nor by any people, unless based on a knowledge of Divine truth, widely diffused and deeply reverenced.'

'In addition to the books sent to Mr. Wheelwright, and to the newly formed auxiliaries in Texas, 500 of the Spanish Gospels of Matthew have been sent to the Hon. Joaquin Marquesa, of New-Grenada.—This gentleman, it will be recollected, is a vice president of the American Bible Society, and is now deeply interested in the establishment of our new schools in his own country. Another grant of 500 Gospels has been made to a mercantile friend in the city of Mexico, for sale or distribution. Others, if required, are to be forwarded. Another grant

of the same number has been made, under similar circumstances, to a gentleman residing at Havanna; and others have been forwarded to Buenos Ayres.'

Nor is the following account of the progress of the work among the Cherokees less cheering. It is an extract of a letter from the Rev. Cephas Washburn, a missionary among the Cherokees west of the Mississippi:—

'If time would permit, I could communicate some facts of an interesting character, relative to the Bible cause. At present the following must suffice. The next Sabbath after our last Bible Society's meeting, I went out into a neighboring settlement, where I have a stated appointment to preach to the Cherokees. Most of my small auditory were members of the Bible Society. They had just received their books, and you might see each one furnished with a copy of Matthew, the Acts, and a hymn book, and each regarding these books as a most precious treasure. I was particularly interested with one full Cherokee woman. She had her Matthew, Acts, and Hymn book, very carefully wrapped in a new silk handkerchief. Before the exercises commenced, she would carefully unfold the handkerchief, read a verse or two in the book of life, then carefully fold up the books, and press them to her breast, while tears of gratitude for the invaluable treasure bedewed her sable cheeks. When the text, which was Matt. iv, 18–22, was announced, all of them took their books and turned to the passage. Never did I address a more deeply interested company. Among them were several consistent professors of religion who are members of the mission Church. At the close of the exercises, sixteen others publicly expressed a determination to forsake all, and "straightway" to follow Christ. When I had mounted my horse to return home, the woman alluded to above came out and detained me. Her face was bathed with tears, but her eyes beamed with thankful joy. She said, "Have you made the paper (meaning this letter) to the society of good people in New-York, who are helping us to get the word of God?" When I told her I had not, but should do so soon, she said, "Do not forget to tell them that my heart is glad for the books I have obtained, and is full of love and thankfulness to them." "Tell them," said she, "I cannot speak how much we are all glad and thankful, and we pray much for those good people every day." So you see, my dear brother, "the blessing of many who were ready to perish" is come upon your Society. This woman is an instance of the rich grace of God. Her first serious impressions were produced by reading the word of God in her own language. These impressions resulted, as we had the best reasons to hope, in her conversion to God, and she was three years since received into the mission Church. At the time of her conversion she was living in a state of widowhood. Subsequently she was married to one of the chiefs, who was much opposed to religion, and grossly intemperate. Her example and exhortations, joined to her prayers, were the means of his hopeful conversion, and of a revival of religion in the neighborhood, which resulted in the conversion of thirteen individuals. She is again a widow, is poor, and is in very feeble health, but is rapidly growing in grace. She is one of the most faithful Christians in the Church. She lets no opportunity for benefiting

the souls of her people pass unimproved. When she goes to a neighbor's house, or when a visitor calls upon her, religion is almost her only subject of conversation, and every interview is closed with prayer, unless her visitors refuse, and in that case they are the subject of her earnest cries to God in secret. I attribute the prevailing attention to religion, in the neighborhood where she now resides, in a great measure to her instrumentality. How grateful it is to put into such hands the word of life!'

In the wide range of the society's operations, the land of the east is not forgotten. And among 'the signs of the times,' which indicate the speedy prostration of idolatry and the uprooting of the foundations of the mighty superstructure raised by the hands of the 'false prophet,' we cannot but notice the glimmerings of light which are tipping the mountains of Mohammedanism, illuminating the dark valleys of eastern paganism, and even penetrating the denser clouds which rest on the hills and dales of Judaism. When the feet of the missionary shall tread unmolestedly the countries which have been so long polluted by Jewish, pagan, and Mohammedan impostures and delusions, with the Holy Bible in his hand, and the Gospel trumpet to his mouth, giving no 'uncertain sound,' we may hope the time is not far distant when these lands of desolation shall be cultivated, when these arid deserts shall become fruitful fields, and when their inhabitants shall be numbered among the Israelites who 'worship God in the spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh.'

Thank God! these signs appear in the east. Along the hills and valleys of Palestine, where Jeremiah wept over the desolations of his country—where Isaiah sang so melodiously of the coming of Messiah, and His consequent victory over the Gentile nations—where this very Messiah appeared, preached, prayed, wrought miracles, suffered and died, and rose again—where Peter and Paul, and others of the chosen band of apostles and disciples, once lifted up their voices in praise and prayer;—even *here*, amidst the 'abominations which make desolate,' set up by the enemies of God and His Christ, are the missionaries of the 'exalted Prince and Savior,' now proclaiming abroad 'the glad tidings of salvation,'—and *here* is the Bible also sent by the munificence of American liberality.

In different parts of the Ottoman empire, where the *beast and the false prophet* have so long held their undiminished sway, this same *witness* for God is wending its way, and speaking in a voice of thunder in the ears of those deluded and lascivious people.

'Within a few weeks,' says this able report, 'an interesting communication has been received from the Rev. William G. Schauffler, missionary of the American Board for Foreign Missions among the Jews at Constantinople, and countries around it.

'"The object of this communication," says the writer, "is to make you acquainted, as far as I am able, with the *state of the Jewish popu-*

lation in the Ottoman empire, from that particular point of view which renders them an object of the Christian charity of your society, and then to propose the *publication of the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament in the Hebrew and Hebrew-Spanish languages*, to supply the perishing wants of these thousands and tens of thousands of immortal souls, all of them still heirs of many a glorious Divine promise, and members of a nation whose universal conversion is so evidently and so intimately connected with the coming of that promised happy period, when all shall know the Lord.

'"Who will beforehand prescribe limits to the effects and consequences of the work of putting the whole Old Testament, intelligibly translated, into the hands of probably some 300,000 souls to read, or to hear it daily; a work to the execution of which no hand, nor foot, nor *finger* ever has been moved throughout vast Christendom down to this present day, although these people have lived and perished before our very threshold!

'"But, dear sir, I have not felt satisfied with merely *proposing*, I have already put my hand to the work. I have begun to revise, in the manner above mentioned, the Psalms in particular, to publish them apart in a smaller form. As soon as this revision is completed, I shall, Providence permitting, print an edition of 3,000 copies, confidently hoping the 'God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,' who has declared 'the silver is mine, and the gold is mine,' will provide for the expenses, by moving the hearts of his people in Christian lands, and, may I not say, by moving *your* hearts?

'"The reasons which have moved me to a publication of the Psalms are the following, viz. It is, in the first place, the book which the Jews most desire to possess, and to understand. 2d. It is peculiarly *devotional*, and pre-eminently calculated to prepare their hearts for a favorable reception of the whole of the Old Testament. 3d. It will probably excite less opposition or anxiety on the part of the rabbis than any other book *not historical*. 4th. We shall see, by this small attempt, what is the probability of success in the publication of the whole Old Testament. 5th. Our precious time is thus improved in some way, and something is doing for the poor Israelites. And, my dear sir, I am really unable to fear that Christians in America would forsake me in an enterprise so evidently called for, so limited, and so promising at the same time.

'"I deem it a matter of gratitude to the good providence of God upon us, that we can print editions of the Old Testament here. This advantage, which the Bible Society may enjoy freely, does not extend to the publication of tracts. For as tracts against the Jews must be more or less polemical, and as the laborers who set up the Hebrew type in the printing offices are Jews, they will obviously lend no hand to us in combating their cherished infidelity; while, according to the positive opinion, both of Arab Ogloo, the Armenian printer, and Mr. Castro, the Jewish printer, there will be no difficulty in procuring their labors in the edition of an Old Testament; and so confident are they that their men will not forsake them, not even at the threats of the rabbis, that they are willing to take the whole responsibility of that part upon themselves, and expect no pay until the work is carried through the press. But I must close this long communication. Let

me only add, that if your Society conclude upon the publication of the *Old Testament*, less than 6000 copies should not be printed, if there is any prospect of success. In fact, that can only be a *beginning* in the great work of supplying with the sacred Scriptures of the Old Testament up to 50 or 60,000 families." '

'A letter dated at Constantinople, in September last, from the Rev. Mr. Dwight, missionary, informs your board that a translation of the book of Psalms into modern Armenian had been made under his direction, and would soon be ready for the press. He contemplates printing first an edition of 1,500 copies. When your board have suitable evidence that the work is correctly translated, they will have great satisfaction in furnishing the means requisite to publish such editions as may be required. The following extract from Mr. Dwight's letter will be read with interest:—

'"Many of the people around us are not able to read, and of course not prepared to receive the Bible into their houses. Many, nevertheless, do read, and it is astonishing to see the power of Scripture truth upon the conscience, when it comes to them from the pure fountain itself, without note or comment, and without the aid of a living teacher. I could point to two young men of the Armenian nation, for whom we have the hope that they have become true disciples of Christ, whose minds were first opened by the simple reading of the Scriptures, before they knew even that there was a missionary in the whole world. Nay, I could point you to many more of the same nation here, upon whom the word of God has had prodigious power—a few passages sweeping away at once a whole catalogue of errors which they had never, before reading the Bible, supposed to be any thing else but precious truths. Nor, among the Armenians of this vicinity, is there the least opposition to the circulation and reading of the Scriptures. There was indeed a case lately—the first I have heard of the kind—and spoken of by the Armenians themselves as new and strange. A young man, the son of a priest, began to read the New Testament, and became so interested, that whenever he was at home that book was never out of his hands. He is engaged in the mercantile business, and being occupied through the day, devoted his evenings at home to his favorite reading. The old priest, his father, became alarmed—so strange was it that a young man should have such a relish for reading the Scriptures—and tried to prevail on him to devote his time to something else. Being unsuccessful, he at length took the Testament by force and locked it up. The matter, however, had taken too deep hold of the young man, and he soon purchased another one; and the priest finding him incorrigible, has at length yielded the point, and gives him no farther molestation. The son calls at my house every day, and is an interesting and hopeful inquirer after the truth."'

'To the Western Foreign Missionary Society at Pittsburg, Pa., there has been made a grant of $500, to be expended by their missionaries, Messrs. Lowrie, Reed, Wilson, and Newton, in circulating the Scriptures in Northern India.—This mission is to be established among the Seik nation, in the province of Lahore, in the northwestern part of Hindostan. These missionaries pass through Calcutta, where, it is said, they can obtain the Scriptures used by the Seik nation, and by other people to be met on the way thither. Your board are happy in making this appropriation; not only because the object aimed at is important, but because the friends of the Bible in Pittsburg have contributed liberally to your funds for this specific object. Every new channel opened for the diffusion of the Bible should call forth fervent gratitude from every heart which appreciates that blessed book, and sees the universal wretchedness of those who are without its instructions.

'Two letters have been received, in the course of the year, from the American missionaries at Ceylon, asking for printing paper, or for means to procure it, for the purpose of publishing the Tamul Scriptures. One of these letters was accompanied by the last report of the Jaffna Bible Society, Ceylon, from which we make the following extract:—

'"There are probably between four and five thousand children under Christian instruction in the schools of the different missionary establishments in the district, a good proportion of whom are able to read. It is evidently of the first importance that these schools should be furnished with a supply of Gospels, not only for the purpose of training the children to read the printed character, but more especially to imbue their tender minds with Scriptural truth, with the hope that, by the Divine blessing, they may thus be preserved from the pernicious and contaminating influence of heathenism, under which most of the adult population is so

powerfully held. To supply each school with ten books, which cannot be considered a large number, would probably require more than a thousand copies; and these, if constantly in use, as it is desirable they should be, generally require to be renewed at least once a year; the habits of native children, even with the most vigilant superintendence, being such as to injure books much faster than in common English schools.

'"The committee are also anxious to furnish each youth, on leaving school, with a Gospel, or some other part of holy writ, so that they may possess a book for which, from the instruction they have received, they may be supposed to have some regard, and which they may, it is hoped, read at their leisure, and thus maintain and increase the knowledge they may have acquired of Scripture truth.

'"The attention of the committee has frequently been directed to the numbers who, within the past fifteen years have received Christian instruction in these little seminaries, the mission schools. They are now coming forward to act their part on the stage of life, have more or less knowledge of Divine truth, and are prepared, to some extent, to understand the Scriptures. To many of them, it may be hoped, a copy of the whole, or even a part of the sacred volume, would prove an acceptable and valuable present." A quotation is also made from another communication of the committee, expressive of their earnest wish to obtain more books for general circulation. "It has," they state, "been a subject of regret, that they had not at their disposal copies of the Bible, to make a more liberal distribution, especially among such persons as, by means of the various Missionary and Tract Society operations carrying forward in the district, are more or less acquainted with Divine truth, and with their obligations to embrace it."

'"The committee regret that in a field where the demand for Scripture is so great, the resources for obtaining funds in aid of the cause are so disproportionate. The annual amount realized by the society is altogether inadequate to meet the expense that must be incurred, if the wants of the district are to be satisfied."'

'In view of the above letters and statements, together with a request from the American board of missions, a grant of $6000 has this year been furnished toward printing and circulating the Scriptures in Ceylon.

'For the circulation of the Scriptures among the Baptist missions in the Burman empire a grant of $7000 has this year been made. The following extract from a letter by the Secretary of the Baptist board of missions, will show the propriety of this grant:—

'"We are urging forward the publication of the Scriptures in Burmah with all the means in our power. In the ship Cashmere, which left this port the 2d inst. for Amh rst and Maulmein, a fourth printer took passage, with nearly two thousand reams of paper and a great amount of other materials for the press and bindery, under his charge. At the last intelligence, beside an edition of the New Testament entire, which was mostly put in circulation, ten thousand copies of Luke and John stitched together, and ten thousand copies of a Digest of Scripture, by the late Mr. Boardman, had issued from the press. The Old Testament is now doubtless in a course of publication. The 6th of September last the Psalms were commenced, and as far as the 24th printed off.

'"We have it in contemplation to send out a fifth press, which may, in fact, be considered as already engaged. The heavy expenditures which these transactions necessarily involve exhaust our treasury fast, and will render highly acceptable whatever remittances it may be convenient for your Society to make. The decision and enterprise manifested by them, and accompanied by the noble resolution in contemplation, to give the Bible to the whole world, have encouraged us to look to their co-operation for most of the means by which the sacred Scriptures shall be given to the perishing millions of Burmah; and the more they authorize us to expect, the more facilities shall we employ to hasten on the accomplishment of the vast and benevolent design."

'The following extract from the journal of the Rev. Mr. Bennett, at Rangoon, October 14, shows that a spirit of inquiry is awake, in relation to Divine truth, although the fear of persecution restrains many from disclosing their feelings and wishes. Opposition, it seems, is made by the jealous Budhists, who see that their system is in danger. Says Mr. Bennett,—

'"The Pahgan inquirer, Ko Long, has been here most of the day, desiring to know more of the truth. I gave him a New Testament, which I pray he may

be enabled to peruse with profit. The man from Ava, (mentioned April 30,) has come down again, and called to-day. He says he gave to one of the king's brothers a book he obtained here; who said, he had one much like it, which he had had for two years, which he had read, and liked, and wished this man to procure him a Testament when he came down to Rangoon. I shall with much pleasure furnish him with not only a Testament, but our other books. He enjoined on this man, however, strict secrecy, and that he must not let any one know he had our books. Several of the followers of this man wished books, which I gave them. This man, and several of his followers, seem very favorable to the truth, but the fear of persecution prevents them from openly avowing it."

'From China your Board have been favored with several communications in the course of the year, parts of which will be subjoined. Soon after your last anniversary a letter was received from the Rev. E. C. Bridgman, missionary at Canton, in which he writes:—

'"I made some general statements in a former letter in regard to the extent of the field which is here to be supplied with the Holy Scriptures. Since that time changes have taken place, new openings have been made for the circulation of books, and a better feeling is rising up with respect to this great work, among Christians. Your own inquiries, and those of Mr. Anderson and others, make it my duty to write to you again.

'"It is impossible for those who have not given particular attention to the situation and character of these eastern nations, to believe that the Chinese empire alone contains 360,000,000 of human beings; or that those who can *read* the Scriptures in the Chinese language constitute more than one third part of our race.

'"For the present the principal part of your grant to this mission will be employed in procuring printing of the Chinese Bible at Malacca. In the meantime, it will probably be best to have some of the separate books published in Canton. The work can be done here with great facility and cheapness.

'"In regard to the circulation of the Scriptures I cannot speak definitely.—Many copies will be needed for immediate circulation; and should a missionary ship be sent out to visit the coast and the Chinese settlements, (and it is very desirable that there should be,) many thousand copies will at once be required, and eventually, perhaps very soon, many millions.

'"In my best moments, at those times, I mean when I have the clearest views of eternal things, it seems to me that the time *has come* when the Gospel of our Lord shall be published through all the length and breadth of this land, and triumph over and destroy all its vain superstitions. The same opinion is cherished by others, as you will see by the accompanying epistle from our brother beloved, the evangelist Leang Afa."

'The individual above referred to has for many years given evidence of having embraced the Christian faith with sincerity. Soon after his conversion he prepared blocks, and printed from them small books from the Scriptures, for the benefit of his countrymen. By so doing he incurred the displeasure of the government, was arrested, severely punished with the greater bamboo, and then set at liberty. "I dared not," says he, "on account of this suffering, to forget the mercy of our Savior in becoming our ransom. But regarding it a glory to suffer shame for our Lord, I examined more closely the sins of my life, and strove with greater perseverance to live according to the rules of the Gospel." He went to the Anglo-Chinese college at Malacca, where he had the instructions of Dr. Milne until the death of that excellent missionary.

'"Having then," he adds, "no one on whom to depend, I returned to Macao, and resided in the house of Dr. Morrison, and for some years studied the Gospel; and by his kind instruction I gradually increased in learning and in the knowledge of the plan of redemption. Then taking the principles of the Gospel, I admonished and instructed my fellow-countrymen. But for a time none believed and obeyed the doctrines of our Lord; recently however, *He* has graciously touched the hearts of some; and now there are among my kindred and friends more than ten persons who believe in and adore the Savior, and live according to the precepts of the Gospel. On every Sabbath day these believers assemble at my house to worship the Supreme Lord; they listen to my preaching, and most joyfully obey and do the will of God. Wherever I preach or exhort, I take these books and distribute them. And this year at the literary examinations in Canton, I distributed them among the literati, who received them with

great joy and gladness. Of both these kinds of books I have distributed all I have. And now the seed of the Gospel has fallen into the hearts of great numbers, and it becomes our chief duty to pray to our heavenly Father that He will send down the Holy Spirit to cause it to spring up and grow, and bring forth the fruits of faith and righteousness unto eternal life.

'"For several years I have been engaged either in preaching the Gospel or in distributing tracts; and our Lord and Savior has graciously vouchsafed His grace to protect and to cause me to enjoy peace and tranquillity of mind. I think this is the time when our heavenly Father will allow us to circulate His holy word in order that the souls of the Chinese may be saved. Therefore I write this epistle and send it to your honorable country, to request the Bible Society, which is composed of warm-hearted and faithful believers, that they will extend wide their benevolence, love their neighbors as themselves, and devise means to aid in printing complete copies of the Bible, and thereby enable me to circulate them among my countrymen, and cause them to know the special grace of our heavenly Father."

'From the Rev. Charles Gutzlaff, the indefatigable missionary in China, two letters have been received in the course of the year. In the first he writes,—

'"I was greatly rejoiced in hearing that you had taken so active a part in the work of God in China; the sphere for your operations is surely immense. As much as it is in my little power, I shall endeavor to spread the precious word of life, and to make known the saving doctrines of the Gospel.

'"You will have heard what resolutions have been taken in regard of bestowing your funds from Mr. Bridgman.

'"I should take the liberty of suggesting to you several measures for forwarding the great work in China, but I wish first to act and then to talk. However, you may rest assured that we will drain your funds, for we have a large nation before us, and if only the hundredth Chinaman was to get a Bible from you, a ten years' income would not be sufficient to defray the expenses.

'"I am now again proceeding to Fokien or Chekeong; you will have in me a faithful correspondent as long as you answer my letters, and I shall endeavor to give you as distinct a statement about the sphere into which you are about to enter, and the language, as far as it regards Scripture translation, in which you wish to glorify the Redeemer, as my feeble capacities will admit.

'"Pray that the Lord may open a great and effectual door. I desire ardently that not only the maritime provinces, but also Gan-hwuy, Hoo-pih, Ize-chuen, and Yun-nan, yea, the whole empire, might see the glory of the Lord."

'In a more recent letter, dated on the 20th of Dec. last, at Macao, he writes:—

'"I inform you with the greatest pleasure, that all the parts of Scripture which were sent to my care were distributed to eager readers at Formosa and in Fokien. A total revision of the whole Chinese Scripture is a matter of urgent necessity, and we have therefore set to work to furnish a new edition, in order to answer the wants of the people. Every care and attention will be bestowed uponthis important undertaking. Lest, however, a delay in disposing of the whole number might occur, we are anxious to arrange an expedition along the whole coast, from Haenan to Kiren, an enterprise which ought no longer to be postponed.

'"If you are willing to supply the demands of China, you will enter upon an immense work. If our missionaries push on boldly, in the strength of the Lord, and constantly travel from one province to the other, the widest circulation of the sacred writ may be anticipated. Only let us not be satisfied with partial success, not slumber as soon as the word of God is printed. The day of small things is past, and it behoves us now to venture all upon the Lord. You can form no idea of the grand sphere upon which you are going to enter; and if our missionaries only keep pace with the zeal and prayers of the people at home, a great and effectual work will be done, under the Divine blessing.

'"You have said nothing about the Indo-Chinese translation, viz. the Siamese, Cambodian, and Laos, for the printing of which the Dutch Bible Society has advanced $800. I have, in the meanwhile, given the whole up to Mr. Robinson, and trust he will expedite the work with care.

'"I am very desirous to see at least a few chapters ready for the press ere I leave this, and some parts engraved. As there are more laborers forthcoming, and all are anxious to co-operate in the great work, you must be prepared for heavy demands. Yet we trust to our God, that while doors are opened, the means will also be supplied for carrying on the blessed work."

'In another communication to one of the managers of the society, Mr. Gutzlaff expresses his desire that distribution of books may be undertaken on a much more extensive scale than has yet been attempted.

' "As long," says he, "as our relations remain the same as at present, a vessel laden with a great number of books, say one million of volumes, ought to perform an annual voyage from Haenan to Kiseri. As Dr. Parker has come out for the express purpose of settling in one of the provinces, he might serve his apprenticeship in the expedition."

'It must be strikingly evident to all who have noticed the finger of Providence, in relation to China, the last few years, that great changes are about to take place in that populous empire. The eyes of the civilized statesman, of the merchant, and of the Christian, are all turned toward her, and the voice of the whole united world cries for the deliverance of her millions from oppression and ignorance.—It can hardly be presumed that another ten years can pass before wide alterations are made in her diplomatic and commercial intercourse with other nations. Nor can this period pass before the soldiers of the cross, now gathering on her borders, and mastering her complicated tongue, will penetrate the interior of her cities and provinces, and proclaim the news of the Gospel in the ears of thousands.

'It is a circumstance of peculiar interest to this society, in looking at the anticipated changes referred to, that the Chinese are so extensively a reading people, and are eager to obtain books. How much more hopeless their condition, were they as untaught as the scattered tribes of Africa and America. How much more difficult the task of enlightening so many millions, were they strangers to the mechanical process of preparing paper, and to the art of printing. But such are the arrangements of Providence, that, in almost every part of that empire, books can be manufactured at a moderate expense and to an unlimited extent. Let the door but open to admit the merchant, an event which cannot be long delayed, and how rapidly would the knowledge of Christianity be diffused by the press, even should the living missionary be for a time excluded. How rapidly might copies of the Scriptures be multiplied by native hands, and furnished to such as would at once peruse them; and thus many be led, like the awakened Ethiopian, to desire some Philip to come and teach them to understand what they read. The utility of the Bible to China is ingeniously as well as truly represented by the Rev. Mr. Abeel, before the British and Foreign Bible Society at its last anniversary. Mr. Abeel observed, that

' "He knew but one missionary in whom he could place complete confidence That missionary he had met in China; he was instructed in languages, and diligent in exertion; he had made voyages from island to island; he had gone forth unaided and alone; he had entered villages and hamlets; he had dared to enter the palace of him who was called 'the Son of Heaven,' and had ventured to tell him of the true way to heaven. That missionary had done the speaker the honor to be his companion, and such another companion he never expected to find.—Where he could not go, that missionary went; what he could not do, that missionary did. He had never left him. In entering regions which had no teacher, he was still his companion. He went among all classes—he abode with him for weeks at a time, he animated all his exertions; and what was most remarkable, with all his powers, with all his elevation of soul, he became his servant. He entered even the junks, and taught the mariners. He went on, and entered China itself. Surely the audience would all desire to know who he was. He would tell them who he was not; he was not a Churchman, nor a Dissenter—he was not a Calvinist, nor an Arminian—he was not an American, nor an Englishman, nor a Scotchman, nor a Hollander. He appeared to hate all sects, and many of those who were the most prominent he had never even mentioned. That missionary was THE BIBLE." '

Through the agency of this and the British and Foreign Bible Society, the holy Scriptures, either in whole or in part, have been translated into one hundred and fifty-eight languages and dialects.

It is known to most of our readers, that in the year 1828 the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was formed by the advice of our General Conference. We were led to this measure chiefly to supply our numerous Sunday schools with the holy Scriptures on the cheapest terms, and the poorer classes of

our own congregations, and also our Indian missions. Though much has been done considering the means at our command, particularly in furnishing translations of portions of the New Testament in the Mohawk language, and the supplying our Sabbath schools with Bibles and Testaments, yet the general efficiency of the Society became doubtful, as it tended to divide the attention of our people between *it* and the American Bible Society, and thereby in a great measure to paralyze their efforts. On this account some of the zealous friends of the cause considered it their duty to make an effort to amalgamate the two societies, that 'Judah might no longer vex Ephraim, nor Ephraim vex Judah.' This gave rise to the following correspondence, reports, and resolutions, which are published in the report, and that they may be reserved for future reference, in case of need, we republish them as the conclusion of our extracts :—

'*Baltimore, July* 10, 1834.

'The committee to whom was referred the preamble and resolutions submitted to the board at its last meeting by the Rev. M. Easter, respectfully report :—

'That they have had the subject under consideration, and as the result of their deliberations, unanimously recommended the adoption of the following resolutions :—

'1. *Resolved*, That a copy of the communications herewith enclosed be forwarded to the editors of the "Christian Advocate and Journal," at New-York, signed by a select number of ministers and influential laymen of the Methodist Episcopal Church in this city.

'2. *Resolved*, That the Corresponding Secretary be instructed to address the American Bible Society, informing them of the anxious desire of this society to effect a union between the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church and our great National Institution, and of the effort we are making to enlist the aid of that influential branch of the Christian Church in this state; requesting to know the sentiments of the American Bible Society on the subject.

'All which is respectfully submitted.

(Signed) SAMUEL BAKER, *Chairman.*
JOHN COLEMAN, *Secretary.*

'At a meeting of the board of managers of the Maryland State Bible Society, held July 17, 1834,

'*Resolved*, That the corresponding secretary be instructed to address the American Bible Society, informing them of the anxious desire of this society to effect a union of the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church with our great National Institution, and of the effort we are making to enlist the aid of that influential branch of the Christian Church in this state; requesting to know the sentiment of the American Bible Society on the subject.

Extracted from the minutes.

ELISHA N. BROWNE, *Cor. Sec. of the Mar. Bib. Soc.*

'*To the Editors of the Christian Advocate and Journal.*

'DEAR BRETHREN,—The undersigned, ministers and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the city of Baltimore, beg leave to address you on a subject of no ordinary importance to the cause of God in general, or to us in particular as Methodists. A Bible convention was held in this city in May, 1833, composed of delegates from many parts of the state, to devise the means of exploring the state, and supplying with the word of truth such as should be found destitute of the sacred volume. A Bible Society was organized by the convention, which has since been occupied in raising auxiliaries in the counties, with branches in the several election districts, to awaken and to perpetuate the proper interest on this deeply interesting subject. In the prosecution of this holy effort, it would appear to be obviously the duty of the Methodists to co-operate, as none can be more concerned in distributing that holy volume which has God for its author, salvation for its end, and "truth without any mixture of error for its matter." Yet our effectual co-operation is greatly embarrassed by what we presume to be the same misunderstanding of the attitude which has been assumed by our Church in regard to this subject. It is believed by many that the formation of a separate Bible Society by the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the purpose of acting independently of the American Bible Society, where a suita-

ble field of labor may present itself, forbids us to unite with the *State Bible Society* in a work which we cannot do ourselves, and which, nevertheless, cannot be done without us.

'You are probably aware of the extensive influence which the Methodists possess in this state, and consequently of the high responsibility which rests upon them to use this influence to the glory of God. It is generally believed here, that without the cordial co-operation of our ministry and membership, the efforts of the Maryland State Bible Society will prove abortive, and who then shall roll this reproach from our door, and above all, how shall we answer it to God!

'Can you not help us to reprove the misapprehensions under which some of our preachers and many of our members labor; for we are assured that it is a misapprehension, from the resolutions passed both by our own and the Virginia annual conference, in favor of a similar effort of the Virginia State Bible Society. The Advocate is considered as the organ of the Church, and if our friends were earnestly exhorted through its columns to come up in this mattter to the help of the Lord, we are persuaded they would no longer hesitate, because they would no longer consider their exertions in the proposed movement as an act of hostility to the institutions of their own Church—an assurance which can no otherwise be given until the ensuing session of the Baltimore annual conference.

'Most earnestly soliciting your aid in this matter, we are yours in the fellowship of Christ.

GEORGE G. COOKMAN,
JAMES SEWELL,
G. C. M. ROBERTS,
T. P. KELSO,
CHRISTIAN KEENER,
THOMAS E. BOND,
R. G. ARMSTRONG,
W. HAMILTON,
THOMAS C. THORNTON,
FRANCIS MACARTNEY,
SAMUEL BAKER,
FIELDER ISRAEL,
JAMES BRUNDIGE.

Baltimore, September, 1834.

'AMERICAN BIBLE SOCIETY HOUSE,
New-York, September 18, 1834.

'At a meeting this morning of the committee appointed by the managers of the American Bible Society, to consider the subject communicated in a letter from the Maryland Bible Society, relating to a union of the American Bible Society and the Methodist Episcopal Bible Society, the following resolution was adopted:—

'*Resolved*, That Dr. James L. Phelps, George Suckley, and Francis Hall, Esq., (managers of the American Bible Society,) be furnished with a copy of the above named letter, and that they be requested respectfully to present the same to the officers of the "Methodist Episcopal Bible Society," and the editors of the "Journal and Advocate," and after due conference with those gentlemen respecting this letter, to inform the committee, so far as may be deemed proper, as to the result of said conference. In behalf of the committee,

J. C. BRIGHAM, *Cor. Sec'y.*

'These documents having been submitted to the managers of the Bible and Tract Society and Sunday School Union of the Methodist Episcopal Church, they appointed a committee to consider and report thereon; and on the eleventh instant the following report was presented at an extra meeting of the board, which was concurred in, and a copy has been sent as directed to the managers of the American Bible Society, and also to the Maryland State Bible Society.

'The committee to whom was referred the communication of the Maryland State Bible Society to the American Bible Society, and the resolution of the board of managers of the latter institution, respectfully report:—

'That the Bible Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church was organized, and is perpetuated on the recommendation of the General Conference, and that no cardinal alteration in its constitution is expedient, until such alteration be communicated to that body at its next session in 1836, even if such course were desirable, which, in the present case, they are happy in believing is not the fact.

'The specific object contemplated by the formation of our society and its aux-

iliaries, was the adequate supply of the wants of our numerous Sunday schools, for which there was no provision by any of the branches of the American Bible Society. This object is still of vast importance, and calls for much more of exertion and liberality than it has as yet received, especially in some of the conferences. It is, therefore, incompatible with our duty and interests, either to dissolve our society, or assume an auxiliary relation to the American Bible Society.

'Toward that noble and popular institution, however, we can have no other feeling than veneration and respect; and in proof of this, if it were necessary, we might appeal to the fact, that several of our board are also acting managers of the national society, and find no incompatibility in their double relation. That great institution has deservedly acquired the confidence of the Christian public for their enterprise and usefulness, which is above all praise. And the Maryland State Society is one of their most efficient and successful auxiliaries, in which we have always rejoiced to hear that very many respectable ministers and members of our Church in Baltimore and elsewhere have been actively and zealously useful. And we unite with them in the expression of regret, that from any misapprehension the Methodist Episcopal Church in Maryland should hesitate in aiding the state society in their laudable exertions to supply every destitute family in their limits with a copy of the Bible, or should seem to be idle or indifferent in this cause. While we should rejoice in the multiplication of our own auxiliaries in that state, yet as we have thus far been denied this pleasure, we shall be perfectly satisfied if our brethren there, and in any state similarly situated, shall organize Bible societies auxiliary to the state and American societies, since both are engaged in the common cause of circulating the Bible "without note or comment." On this broad and catholic ground "we be brethren," and there need be no strife, and in the present case there can be no competition.

'With the view of meeting the present case, and any subsequent one of similar character, your committee recommend the adoption of the following resolutions, which they hope will remove any future misapprehensions on this subject, viz.—

'1. *Resolved*, That it is not expedient before the next session of the General Conference, either to dissolve this society or essentially modify its constitution.

'2. *Resolved*, That as the American Bible Society has the full confidence and Christian affection of this board, we disclaim any design to oppose and hinder in the least the useful operations of that institution or any of its auxiliaries, and should sincerely deprecate such result.

'3. *Resolved*, That the Maryland State Bible Society, being engaged in the praiseworthy effort to supply the destitute within their borders, and being conducted by a board of managers in whose integrity and piety we fully confide, is worthy of the patronage and liberality of the Christian public, and we affectionately commend it to the prayers and contributions of our brethren in that state.

'4. *Resolved*, That the duty of promoting the circulation of the holy Scriptures is obligatory on all the friends of Christ, and we earnestly exhort our brethren to form Bible societies in every station and circuit throughout the land; and although we should prefer that they become auxiliary to our board, yet if any of them should see cause not to attach themselves to us, and discover that they can be more useful by uniting with state societies, or with the American Bible Society, they have our entire and hearty concurrence.

'5. *Resolved*, That should any Bible Societies choose to purchase Bibles and Testaments from our depository, they may procure them on the same terms, whether auxiliary to the American Bible Society, or directly auxiliary to us.

'6. *Resolved*, That a copy of this report be sent to the American Bible Society, to the Maryland State Bible Society, and that it be printed in the "Christian Advocate and Journal." Signed by order of the board,

N. Bangs, *6th Vice President.*

Samuel Williams, *Rec. Sec'y.*

New-York, Nov. 11, 1834.

DESCRIPTION OF A MOUND,

Recently discovered on the banks of the Genesee river.

Mr. Tucker,—If the antiquities of the country are of interest to the agriculturist, I send you for publication in the Farmer the following description of an ancient mound, lately found on the banks of the Genesee river in clearing the land for a crop of wheat.

The mound is about ninety feet in circumference, thirty feet diameter, and eight feet in height. It is in the centre of a flat piece of ground of about six rods square, bounded on the north by a ravine one hundred and fifty feet deep perpendicular banks, on the east by gently rising ground, on the south by another ravine, equal to the one on the north in depth; on the west the river banks descend precipitously to the river about three hundred feet. It is situate nearly opposite the late residence of Mary Jamieson, the '*white woman.*' The site is truly romantic, and the prospect the most beautiful that can be imagined, commanding an extensive view up and down the Genesee river, and over the Gardow flats, with parts of the towns of Castile and Perry, and which would be much increased if the woods were more cleared away. On making an excavation into the mound a skeleton was discovered, with the head placed to the centre, lying on the back, the head resting on a flat stone, the arms folded across the breast, and the feet extending toward the circumference of the mound; large round stones of from forty to eighty pounds weight were placed on each side of the skeleton, and over these and the skeleton were placed flat stones. The bones were in a very decayed state, and would not preserve their form when exposed to the air. Parts of three skeletons were discovered in about one eighth of the whole mound, or the section in which the excavation was made.

Over one of the skeletons was placed twenty-six arrow heads, one stone knife, and a stone cleaver; also a copper skewer of about six or seven inches in length, about the size of a pipe's tail, flattened a little at one end, and slightly twisted. The stone knife is of very fine hard stone, clouded green, three or four inches in breadth, and about seven in length, with a small hole in the middle, and about the thickness of a half quire of paper, sharpened edges. The cleaver of about the same dimensions as the knife, cut off square, and several notches made on one end; a hole in the middle. This is of soft slate stone. The pipe bowl was made of coarse sand stone, about an inch square, and rudely ornamented by rubbing notches on the upper edge of the bowls.

All the articles are of the rudest workmanship. Even the arrow heads were the rudest that can be found, and seem to have been made when the skill of making arrow heads was yet in its infancy. Large trees were found standing on the mound. These relics may be seen at the store of D. and T. Aylsworth, on the river road, in Mount Morris. Respectfully yours, &c,

William B. Munson.

Brook's Grove, Livingston co., N. Y., July 13, 1835.

THE NOBLENESS OF HUMILITY.

On the day of Charlotte county election, in 1799, as soon as Patrick Henry appeared on the ground, says Mr. Wirt, he was surrounded by the admiring crowd, and wheresoever he moved, the concourse followed him. A preacher of the Baptist Church whose piety was wounded by this homage paid to a mortal, asked the people aloud, 'Why they thus followed Mr. Henry about?' 'Mr. Henry,' said he, 'is not a God!' 'No,' said Mr. Henry, deeply affected both by the scene and the remark, 'no, indeed, my friend, I am but a poor worm of the dust—as fleeting and unsubstantial as the shadow of the cloud that flies over your field, and is remembered no more.' The tone with which this was uttered, and the look which accompanied it, affected every heart and silenced every voice. Envy and opposition were disarmed by his humility; the recollection of his past services rushed upon every memory, and he 'read his history,' in their swimming eyes.—*Western Methodist.*

29 39927

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY AT CLAREMONT
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA